

MAR 6 1950

Q.P.

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

THE LONDON QUARTERLY AND HOLBORN REVIEW

EDITOR: LESLIE F. CHURCH, B.A., Ph.D.

JANUARY 1950

Price 4s.

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL COMMENTS, by Leslie F. Church, B.A., Ph.D.

ARTICLES

The Methodist Marcellinus, F. Brompton Harvey

Solitariness and Community in Religion in Whitehead's Philosophy, Bernard E. Jones, M.A., B.D.

Communism in India, J. Lawson Garforth

The Treatment of Disease in New Testament Times, Joan M. Frayn, B.A., Ph.D.

The Funeral of Progress: Do we Mourn?, J. F. Butler, M.A., Ph.D.

John Millington Synge (1871-1909), Alan L. Brown, B.A.

ECUMENICAL SURVEY

The Word of God in the Theology of Barth, Gustaf Wingren, Teol. Dr.

German Methodism and its Relations with other Churches, Friedrich Wunderlich, Dr. Theol.

"... not only of one tongue ...", Don Kirkpatrick, M.A.

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

J. M. Keynes and a Memoir, Charles Gimblett, M.A.

The Function of Religious Drama in the Modern World, Jessie Powell

A Psychological Revolution? (The Reach of the Mind, by J. B. Rhine), Eric S. Waterhouse, M.A., D.D., D.Lit.

A South African Pioneer (The Life and Times of Daniel Udney, by Edwin W. Smith), Allen Lee

RECENT LITERATURE, Edited by C. Ryder Smith, B.A., D.D.

FROM MY NEW SHELF, C. Ryder Smith, B.A., D.D.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

LONDON
THE EPWORTH PRESS
FRANK · H · CUMBERS

25 - 35 · CITY ROAD · E.C.1

The London Quarterly and Holborn Review

LITERATURE HISTORY SOCIOLOGY
RELIGION THEOLOGY PHILOSOPHY

Editor: LESLIE F. CHURCH, B.A., Ph.D.

The London Quarterly and Holborn Review is published on the 25th of March, June, September, and December by the Epworth Press, 25-35 City Road, London, E.C.1. It may be obtained from the publishers or any bookseller at 4s. a copy (postage 3d.) or 15s. per annum, post free.

All contributions (typewritten, if possible), should be addressed to The Editor, 'The London Quarterly and Holborn Review', 25-35 City Road, E.C.1, with stamped addressed envelope for return in case of non-acceptance.

NATIONAL—

but not nationalized

Despite all the Government is doing for children deprived of a normal home life, the National Children's Home, like all the other recognized voluntary societies, is left free to carry on the work it has pioneered for over eighty years. This means it still has to raise its own income—a formidable task when it is remembered that nearly 4,000 girls and boys are being cared for.

We mention this point because there is widespread misunderstanding of the Home's present position. The need for funds is as great as ever, and it is hoped that you will keep on helping. In fact, even more support is required to meet the increased cost of maintaining this important national service.

NATIONAL CHILDREN'S HOME

Chief Offices: Highbury Park, London, N.5

Editorial Comments

WORLD ORDER

IN MOST of the civilized countries of the world there is at least a minority of people who are internationally minded. It is unfortunate that in some quarters the mere mention of World Government is regarded with suspicion. Any suggestion that some part of national sovereignty might have to be surrendered in the cause of world-peace is denounced as a betrayal. The effort of the late Lord Lothian to outline a scheme of federal union was criticized on the same grounds, but, too often, the criticism provided no kind of alternative. The internationalism of the Marxist communist is not the only shape World Government could assume, and there is urgent need for all men of goodwill to approach the whole problem with open minds.

In the opinion of many statesmen the United Nations Organization, in spite of its present apparent weakness, represents the only way to World Government. As the Prime Minister of India has said: 'It is easier to turn the United Nations into World Government than to make it start all over again.'

In defining India's ideals in relation to world affairs, Pandit Nehru speaking to the University of California said recently: 'These ideals are essentially of peace and co-operation, of national freedom, of growing internationalism leading to a world order of equality among nations and peoples, and of eradication of want and misery from millions who suffer from it.' Like the Governor-General, Shri C. Rajagopalachari, and other representative Indians, he hopes and believes that the United Nations will evolve a soul of its own, but such a goal is not reached in a moment. It will come about only by the subordination of lesser loyalties to a wider loyalty. Local and national interests must be linked to the well-being of the whole of mankind. The United Nations is more than an idealistic organization; it is as the *Times of India* has pointed out, 'a piece of intricate machinery dealing with facts, policies, and Governments'. Whilst it is a symbol, it is also the only place where the nations can ventilate their problems and 'debate the explosive issues that divide them'. For this reason it should encourage the critics to consider its efforts as, at least, a partial success rather than to condemn its interim results as complete and permanent failure.

Aggression and attacks on the freedom of the individual must be resisted and such resistance can only be successful by united action. There is increasing evidence not only of the necessity for economic co-operation, but of an increasing desire to achieve it. This is encouraging in view of the present tension, but it will not succeed until it is planned on a scale which embraces the whole world. This means the inclusion of the less privileged and under-developed peoples.

If it be true that the greatest barrier to peace is psychological, it is obvious that the first task is, as Pandit Nehru has said, 'to put an end to the psychology of fear and to encourage the growth of goodwill among all peoples'.

In a recent broadcast from Delhi, the Governor-General of India again

pledged India's loyalty to the United Nations. After making a powerful plea that all peoples should express their abhorrence of violence with as strong a conviction as they assert their religious faith, he said: 'Predictions have been recently made in high quarters that a race in atomic arms is inevitable. There can be no worse news for the world. A race in atomic armaments will not lead to peace any more than the armament races of old did. Let us devoutly pray that this new weapon will go into the limbo of forgotten things, or be material only for fables and stories and no longer remain on the programme of nations. Can we not save the last chapter of human progress from becoming a record of total insanity and destruction?

'On behalf of the people of India and her Government, I renew today our pledge of loyalty to the United Nations Organization and prayerfully hope that in spite of every discouragement and every obstacle, it will develop an undaunted spirit and serve as an instrument of world peace. The Organization may evolve a soul of its own which may be greater than that of any of its individual members, and thereby the Organization may triumph over the failings of even the greatest among its members.'

Here is, it seems to us, a noble appeal based on faith, and not on a vague optimism, the child of wishful-thinking. However remote the possibility of World Government may appear—however great its cost by way of individual sacrifice—if it be the way to universal peace, no man of good-will can refuse to consider it. The only adequate answer to the challenge of a world order based on force is a World Government established by mutual understanding, co-operation, and goodwill. To such an order men might bring their lesser loyalties not as sacrificial victims to be destroyed, but as separate and vital factors which should contribute to the parliament of man, the federation of the world.

THE BATTLE OF THE BLIND

IF SOME of the amoral, utilitarian planning of today were carried to its logical conclusion, blind people might be classed as non-productive, or only partially productive, and so be considered as a liability which should be avoided. In short, the materialist might consistently talk of liquidation or elimination. Fortunately, human nature is not, and never will be, materialistic in its final outlook. It is unthinkable that any large body of opinion would support such a recommendation, though we have heard the blind and the aged theoretically condemned to death!

Blindness has, however, raised a secondary problem. Granting the right of the blind to survival, the moral responsibility for their happiness rests either on the State or the individual, or on both. Recent events have shown that the State and voluntary organizations to promote the welfare of the blind can work in a happy and complete partnership. 'Democracy without voluntary exertion and idealism has lost its soul,' said Lord Pakenham. The present Minister of Health confirmed this principle when on 3rd March 1949 he said in the House of Commons: 'In my opinion, the voluntary organizations are the only means by which effective assistance can be given to handicapped classes of all kinds.' This was an important statement, which should be constantly

remembered by all who are concerned with the shaping of a Welfare State. Impersonal ministers are always lacking in an essential quality of true service. It is the personal touch which makes the vital difference.

By some strange circumstance on the day after Mr. Bevan had made his declaration, which has wider implications than perhaps he realized, His Majesty the King approved a Royal Charter of Incorporation for the National Institute for the Blind. In its Annual Report¹ there is this comment: 'Blind Welfare today is a co-operative effort of the State and Voluntary Bodies in partnership, and the harmonious relationship now firmly established between statutory and voluntary forms of assistance can best be preserved by fostering the vigour, efficiency, adaptability, and idealism of the voluntary system.'

It is encouraging to learn that, at a time when individual responsibility and privilege tends to be minimized or forgotten, the voluntary services to the blind are growing in extent and importance. 'Blindness is a terrible fact; it can be fought, it can be defeated, it can be enchained—but it cannot be killed.' The National Health Services Act has not lessened the need for financial aid, for the activities of the National Institute do not fall within the definition of health services. The fundamental idea on which these activities are based may best be described in the language of the Report as 'educating the blind, from infancy to old age, in the means of overcoming blindness physically, mentally, and spiritually'.

For eighty-one years the Institute has been publishing books, periodicals, and booklets in Braille. The Moon Society, which was founded in 1848, published similarly in the type invented by Dr. Moon, and though in 1914 the Society was merged in the Institute, more than a million books and booklets have been issued in Moon's type in the last thirty-five years. One blind man wrote recently: 'I have been reading Moon for nearly six years, and during that time have read the Bible through'.

The total output of the Institute is astonishing, not only for its quality but for its wide range of subjects. *The Methodist Hymnbook*, in the publishing of which the Epworth Press was proud to have a share, is only one amongst many books of hymns and poetry in general. There are three main heads under which the publications, as a whole, are classified—cultural, educational, and recreational. These include text-books and manuals, classical and religious literature, periodicals, topical reports, and fiction. The most recent list of publications contains books by J. B. Priestley, T. S. Eliot, and Lloyd Douglas, as well as Winston Churchill's *Second World War*, Seavers' *Albert Schweitzer, Gardening Month by Month*, and Gray's *Anatomy* which will need more than fifty Braille volumes to complete it. Several annuals are issued, including *The Times Review of the Year* and *The Churchman's Almanack*. The publication of music in Braille is an important and highly specialized branch of the work. Students are provided with 'any text-book in any language and on any subject'. This is made possible through the invaluable work of voluntary Braille transcribers, one of whom has transcribed sixty volumes during the past year. Many of the books requested are standard technical works, law-books, and the classics. Here is a piece of personal service which demands patience and intelligence,

¹ Report for 1948-9, National Health Institute for the Blind, 224, 226, 228 Great Portland Street, London, W.1.

but which can be earnestly commended to people with leisure and a social conscience.

The weapons which the blind need in their grim battle are constantly being improved as the result of research work. Recent devices have made it possible for the blind to write, take shorthand notes, play cards, read and understand maps, and thread needles. During the past twelve months they have been provided with watches, alarm-clocks, improved writing-machines, bread-cutters, puzzles, music-rests for the heavy Braille folios, signature guides to help in the signing of Pension Books, protractors, and white sectional walking-sticks which may be carried in a hand-bag.

One of the most appreciated services is the library of Talking Books. During the year 30,000 have been borrowed, which has meant the issuing of half a million records. In a letter received, a blind woman wrote: 'I am deeply grateful. I am now "reading" my 145th book.'

Unfortunately blindness is not confined to the aged, and some of the most essential work is concerned with the education of sightless children. The National Institute now has eight 'Sunshine Home Nursery Schools'. In England and Wales there are twenty residential schools for blind children from 5 to 16 years of age, who receive a general education. In the two Secondary Grammar Schools excellent results are being obtained, even in competition with children who can see. At Worcester College, for example, nine boys obtained School Certificates, and seven the Higher Certificate. (That word 'obtained' was not well chosen. Nine boys *won* School Certificates—for let it never be forgotten that they are fighting a battle against the power of darkness, and are winning victories, not merely obtaining successes!) As they grow up they may attend Schools for Shorthand and Typing, Telephony or, even more remarkable, a newly-established School of Physiotherapy.

In England and Wales there are 78,000 blind men, women, and children. At St. Dunstan's 2,250 ex-service men are treated, but with this exception, all blind people are the responsibility of the National Institute in co-operation with Local Authorities and local voluntary agencies.

Much is being done at rehabilitation centres to place the able-bodied blind in industry and commerce. When this is found to be impossible they are trained to become home-workers. In every way they are encouraged to count themselves as citizens, with the responsibilities and privileges of independent members of the community. A personal assistance bureau conducted by a blind lawyer guides them, even in the matters of form-filling. The more completely the blind man can fulfil the normal obligations of an ordinary member of society, the more independent he becomes, and the more conscious of winning his battle. The number of unemployable blind is steadily decreasing. Preventive work is extending, and its influence is being felt in the Middle East, in India, and in Pakistan.

To read the Report of the National Institute for the Blind is to renew our hope in the future of mankind. The heroism of the blind in their battle for normality, and the patience and skill of those who help them challenge our pessimism. Moral standards have deteriorated, and life seems to have sunk

(continued on p. 27)

Articles

THE METHODIST MARSEILLAISE

ALPHONSE DAUDET has a story of an old miller, Maître Cornille, whose windmill had long been a landmark in the countryside. But now a great steam-driven factory has filched his livelihood. Yet, long after the farmers took their corn elsewhere, Maître Cornille was to be seen in the evenings marching behind his donkey which was laden with sacks. Here was a mystery! One day, the miller being absent, some of the villagers climbed into the old mill by a ladder, and found the place forlorn and covered with cobwebs. There was no sign of corn, no pleasant smell of wheat as it was crushed by the revolving stones. In a corner were a few sacks of white plaster. These were the sacks that the donkey had been carrying for years to create an impression of still thriving business.

The world is inclined to regard the Christian Church as a venerable mill which has been superseded by more modern institutions. Once it did a large business; and still the ecclesiastical sails turn doggedly round and make a pathetic pretence of prosperity.

So the world thinks; but it is mistaken. The Church is still in commission. The aim of this article is to prove that what we purvey is not white plaster but the authentic bread of life.

The Wesleys have now by general consent attained *emeritus* rank. From plaques and stained windows in national shrines they look out serenely upon a deferential world. It is a dangerous dignity. Prophets achieve more in the days of their stoning than when statues are being erected in their honour.

Is there some quality in the Wesleys that prevents their being relegated to an honorific pedestal? Have they in addition to their historical prestige any vital relevance to the twentieth century?

An arrogant fashion prevails of pretending that the present age is altogether unique and that remedies that were well enough in their time are outworn and useless now. It is true that every age has its own *ethos*—its characteristic axioms. We should be foolish to try to ignore what science and large-scale production have given us, or deny the drive toward collectivity. But acceptance of contemporary civilization and its standards does not necessarily mean acquiescence. One may serve one's age, after the manner of the Hebrew prophets, by challenging it. Wesley was a man of the eighteenth century; yet if in some ways he reflected it, it is more important to remember how vigorously he withstood and corrected it.

In all epochs men have asserted that there was an inherent correspondence between Christianity and the prevailing category of the hour—imperialism, feudalism, capitalism, socialism, and now communism. Although Christianity has certain discoverable affinities with every one of these (indeed some of them are spilt religion or heresies), one may suspect that the connexion is not as absolute as is claimed by partisans. It is the fate of the Faith to be thus annexed by bribery or terrorism. Nowadays it is the sociologists and psychologists

who tell us what we may believe; in the nineteenth century it was the scientists; in the eighteenth the philosophers; in the sixteenth and seventeenth the Prince.

The fact is that under the surface all ages are very much alike. Ancient opponents appear in up-to-date costume. There are no new heresies. A slight knowledge of Church history will reveal how old-fashioned modernism is. Emphases may change; essentials remain constant. It gives one something of a shock to realize that under the fantastic revolutions in dress—Assyrian, Greek, Roman, Medieval, Elizabethan, Stuart, Georgian, Victorian—the human form remains unaltered. Although Wesley warned his disciples, 'You must be singular or be damned,' he was far from encouraging them to be perverse or cantankerous. He himself was the most urbane and best-mannered of the prophets.

His mission was to witness to the things that cannot be shaken, the permanent truths that are age-long and world-wide. For this reason he was compelled to be in opposition; that is, to lay stress upon those elements of truth that were in danger of eclipse. We may take it for granted that a genuine Christian programme will rarely be popular: for this, in practice, means striking a bargain with the spirit of the age; or, worse still, with the dominant political party. One has only to remember the Church's compromising alliance with the Court (sixteenth and seventeenth centuries); the Whigs (the eighteenth), the Tories (the nineteenth), to be sceptical of any such concordat in the twentieth. Like many ministers of State, the Church does her best work in opposition.

If we ask then, 'What are the vital elements in Christianity which today are slighted?', we shall obtain a valuable clue to the message and mission of Methodism. It is remarkable that the hymn which in Wesley's own day was felt to be a classic statement of the Methodist call and character, should possess so striking a relevance two centuries later. We have ventured to call it *The Methodist Marseillaise*; for it was and is the Battle Hymn of the People called Methodists. We refer, of course, to Charles Wesley's *A Charge to keep I have*. This hymn, simple and virile, contains the essentials not merely of Methodism, but of Christianity.

Are not its four main notes, the Divine, the Personal, the Otherworldly, the Social—the very notes which from one quarter or another are vehemently challenged at the present time? When this four-fold message, with all its implications, is realized, it will be found to be no moribund gospel.

I. THE DIVINE NOTE: A GOD TO GLORIFY

None will question that there has been a grave decline in the theocentric temper of religion. We are not now referring to the militant atheism of the Marxians with their watchword: 'God is a name my soul abhors.' Our concern is with the weakening of the sense of the primacy of God among professed Christians.

The driving force of Wesley was the conviction that holiness was the proper aim of every Christian life, the only standard of Christian perfection, and the supreme offering man can make to God. A re-reading of his *Treatise on Christian Perfection* and of Charles Wesley's hymns brings home in almost startling fashion their overwhelming sense of God's reality.

Is there a thing beneath the sun
That strives with Thee my heart to share?
Ah, tear it thence, and reign alone,
The Lord of every motion there!

In all things nothing may I see,
Nothing desire or seek but Thee!

The same note is struck in the more familiar and much loved

Forth in Thy name, O Lord, I go,
My daily labour to pursue,
Thee, only Thee, resolved to know
In all I think, or speak, or do.

The Wesleys were men of God. In its essence their life was a dialogue with God. Evelyn Underhill's verdict may be trusted: 'Though on the ethical side the Methodist standard was austere, all was penetrated by their passionate delight in God, their adoring abandonment to His will and purpose, the sense of a vital and enabling relationship with the living Christ.'

Today we are man-conscious, and in peril of being man-centred. A recent Anglican Conference, for example, declared that our primary need was to define the Christian doctrine of man. The confession occasioned no surprise. How sinister and subversive it would have seemed to Wesley. (Theology had not then been swamped by psychology.) Once concede that our first interest is man, or that we know more about man than about God, and religion has signed its own death warrant. Logically such preoccupation with the human leads to the replacement of religion by ethics.

With the loss of the sense of the primacy of God, every element in religion is not only diluted but dissolved. *Worship* dwindles into refined self-culture, a branch of aesthetics; *Prayer* becomes a form of Couéism, a communion with our own selves; *Sin* is nothing but folly, self-mutilation; *Penitence* is merely remorse, disillusionment, self-pity, a self-administered rebuke; *Salvation* becomes self-fulfilment, integration, the assimilation of a complex; *Social Service*, instead of being rooted in the love of God, an offering to those for whom Christ died, degenerates into neighbourliness. The whole currency of religion is debased when man usurps the throne of God. Worse still, religion comes to be regarded as instrumental—a means to an end. Since the end must be greater than the means, it follows that morals and man are more important than religion and God. Religion becomes the engine that works the ethical and social mill. Men set out to *use* God rather than worship Him. As the Patron of religion, He is expected to join the General Purposes Committee at the Town Hall, and make Himself generally useful. Those who are obsessed by the desire to achieve industrial peace or international concord welcome Christianity as a useful ally. To Wesley all this would have seemed profanity.

Those who court religion for the sake of its dividends prepare for themselves nothing but disappointment. The world *needs* God, but it does not *want* Him. The task of the Church is to transmute that need into want. When we seek God's gifts rather than Himself, we are still putting ourselves in the centre

and our Maker into the wings. It is *ego et rex meus*. The Church's supreme privilege and duty is to bring mankind face to face with God. In the long run all questions are theological. When the Divine note is muffled, the mystery, the urgency, the glory of religion depart. There is no longer the tremendous authority of 'a Throne set' in the Heavens. The sense of absolute obligation is lost. If God goes, godliness goes; and when godliness goes, goodness, sooner or later, goes with it. The moderns have set man on the world's vacant throne (sometimes with Christian connivance); but though it is hard to worship God, it is harder still to keep on worshipping an idol. Is it not significant that when fixed instincts (like belief in God) are repressed, they burst out in some abnormal direction. If you are not allowed to believe in heaven, you begin to believe in heaven on earth; if you stop believing in God, you begin to believe in the godlikeness of man. Denied the worship of the Most High, men deify Lenin or Hitler or even Bernard Shaw. But man-worship cannot last; it becomes first an absurdity and then a bore. The consciousness that there are standards immutable and holy, that something in the universe is true and inviolable, worth living for and worth dying for, is a moral indispensable.

Of all Christian thinkers in our time, Von Hügel was the most balanced and comprehensive. On his tombstone at Stratton Fosse are the words which were the spring of his whole faith and being, '*Quid enim mihi est in caelo, et a te quid volui super terram?*' This was also John Wesley's chosen text. In his *Character of a Methodist* he says: 'God is the joy of his heart and the desire of his soul, which is continually crying, "Whom have I in heaven but thee, and there is none upon earth whom I desire beside Thee".'

For my part, when in spiritual matters Wesley and Von Hügel are of one mind, I regard their agreement as equivalent to a demonstration.

II. THE PERSONAL NOTE—'A CHARGE TO KEEP I HAVE'

My calling. My trust. Throughout the hymn the personal pronoun predominates. It occurs no fewer than nine times. Such reiterated emphasis shows how jealously Wesley insisted upon the rights and responsibilities of individuals. Today the crown rights of the individual are gravely challenged both from Right and Left. Berdyaev was never tired of declaring that Christianity is at the present turning-point of history the one Power that champions and guarantees the integrity of persons—their inalienable rights and duties. No Christian truth stands out more prominently against encroaching totalitarianism than the doctrine of the sacred value of each single life. Most of our Lord's parables turn upon the infinite worth of every soul. As J. B. Mozley put it: 'Mankind is all mass to the human eye, but it is all individual to the divine.' It is a commonplace that the conception of human personality, as we have come to understand it, is the direct result of Christianity, nor can it (or any genuine democratic order) survive bereft of the backing of Christian belief.

We are confronted by a theory which finds the whole meaning of the human soul in history. On this view the individual is nothing but a product and a part of the society of which he is a member. The significant aspect of human life is thus not the spiritual integrity of souls, but the social development of communities. Persons are depressed; peoples enthroned. The proposition that the

individual is nothing but a fraction of a social whole may be true enough about bees and termites but it is not the truth about any human beings of whom we have any knowledge. Even in primitive societies, when tribal categories were admittedly supreme, the individual human being possessed some measure of self-conscious personality that raised his soul above the waters of the collective unconscious. From the Christian standpoint the treatment of the individual as a mere item of the community is a denial of the primary and fundamental relation between the soul and God. Leviathan has usurped divine prerogatives.

We have seen in Sparta, in the Ottoman empire, and in the totalitarian régimes established by revolutionary force in our time, what we may expect. It is worth recalling that a noble—perhaps the noblest conceivable—form of this Leviathan worship was decisively rejected by the early Church. If any human community was ever worthy of devotion it was Rome in the days of Trajan and the Antonines. Yet the Church refused to bow the knee to Baal, and suffered as we know rather than put man in the place of God. They realized that the very citadel of Christianity was being assaulted.

Christian doctrine teaches that man was neither made by the State, nor for it. He does not really belong to it. He has qualities that were not created by the State, and that no conceivable State could satisfy. In truth the State's primacy is one of might rather than right. It intimidates rather than attracts. Most men have stronger and more intimate ties with other institutions. Yet the State monster decrees that all other associations (family, club, lodge, church) which really absorb their members must go. And this even though the members might have solemnly promised to keep the laws or rules of such membership, whereas they have made no specific promise to the State and have never even been consulted as to their wish to do so. Modern totalitarianism does not shrink from compelling its subjects to render unto Cæsar the things of God. The Church is viewed as the creature and servant of the State, and will be tolerated only so long as it toes the line of the prevailing ideology. We see the thing happening starkly before our eyes in Czechoslovakia.

Can it be doubted in the light of events that the freedom of the Church and the integrity of human personality go hand in hand? There could be no place for a Methodist in any of the totalitarian States. A typical Methodist simply could not breathe the air. We have gloried in encouraging individuality and a dauntless independence. No Church has produced a greater proportion of those glorious and entertaining beings called 'Characters'. The Good Shepherd calls the sheep of His flock by name. (Even sheep become individualized by Christianity.) Behind the Iron Curtain such a novelist as Dickens is quite unthinkable; for there, what people shall be taught, to what they must listen, how they are to think and feel and behave and use their leisure, are more and more decided by a relatively small number of persons who have seized upon the national controls. Trotsky baldly stated the position: 'The mass production of opinion is the corollary of the mass production of goods.' The crucial issue is whether persons are immortal spirits, the objects of God's inestimable love, or a mere temporal phenomenon extinguished at death. One or other of these views must prevail. They cannot subsist together in the same society. The totalitarian robot could not so much as say a Paternoster, for the

creature of the State cannot be 'a son of God', that is a God-centred being. When God goes, man goes.

Let it be remembered that Christianity is very far from condoning social irresponsibility. (It is rather the collective State which puts a premium upon man's desire to escape responsibility. The obligations of a hired servant are so much less than those of a son.) Christianity alone binds together the individual and the society in a unity which permits neither mass thinking in which the individual withers, nor the selfishness which develops the interests of individuals at the cost of injury to others. In the Divine purpose human society is the sum of single lives indissolubly united by a common love derived from and centred in God. God is the source of man's true life, individual and social. Individuals in revolt from God become centred in self and mutually hostile. Society thus composed of individuals in conflict multiplies the evils of individualism in a mass selfishness whose inescapable doom is self-destruction. To expect a cure for this from re-shuffling class conditions and reorganizing international relations is like sprinkling cancer with rose-water. In T. E. Hulme's courageous words: 'Wickedness will not automatically disappear under socialism or fascism; much of it will find a new outlet.' It is already evident that nationalization works no moral transformation. As a Trade Unionist official confessed, 'It is the same old racket under a different name'; while the frantic admonitions of Mr. Attlee and his colleagues suggest that even they have been compelled to visualize the awful possibility of proletarians becoming parasites!

The problem is to awaken every individual to an effective sense of moral responsibility. In the long run the quality of our society is determined by the quality of our individuals. There is no by-passing the personal factor. It is useless to conjure up the virtue of government control. *Quis custodet!* There cannot be a rule of law which is not ultimately a rule of men. Depersonalized socialism can make sure of nobody. Wesley was not deficient in social conscience, but he believed in making sure of the individual, the pivot on which all else turns. He would not think much of our modern schemes for entering the Promised Land without having to cross Jordan. There is no progress except through the conscious effort of individuals.

May we not say that Wesley's individualism is in accord with the deepest instincts of human nature? The idea of free fraternal individuals and families owning their own farm or house or business, one man one house—is not this still the real vision and magnet of mankind? The world in its plight may accept a makeshift—something more official and general, less human and intimate, but it cannot welcome it. To use G.K.C.'s illustration: 'It will be like a broken-hearted woman who makes a humdrum marriage because she may not make a happy one.'

Socialism is a medicine—not a food. It may be the world's desperate means of escape: it can never be the world's desire.

III. THE OTHERWORDLY NOTE

*A NEVER DYING SOUL TO SAVE
AND FIT IT FOR THE SKY*

Such words would make a good Marxist sick! He has been taught to dismiss otherworldliness as 'pie in the sky'. The retreat from otherworldliness has gone

very far. The whole dimension of eternity is rapidly fading out of the modern consciousness, and even from the *Christian* consciousness. From the contemporary Písgah, visibility is very poor. A body of North of England Christians recently criticized our hymn because of 'its selfish individualism and its escapist otherworldliness'. It is doubtless true that at some periods Christians have been so overwhelmed by the magnitude of Eternity as to have been excessively indifferent to the needs and wrongs of this present world. In our day the temptation is all the other way. Where, between these oscillating extremes, does the truth lie?

There can be no question that Christianity is essentially otherworldly. Its permanent centre of gravity is not in this world; it is elsewhere. Eternal issues are involved in human destiny. The Church has an urgent task to revive and reaffirm the Eternal Note. A Church which subordinates its eternal perspectives and sanctions to any temporal good has parted with its title-deeds and is false to the New Testament model. Nevertheless, Christian otherworldliness does not spell indifference to this life.

Few Christians have been more vividly in love with this daedal earth than Chaucer. Yet his considered verdict is: 'Here is no home: here is but wilderness.' Possibly the religion of the Incarnation hardly justifies so relentless a judgement: such a religion is neither purely this-worldly nor otherworldly. Christianity does not despise (let alone loathe) the seen and the temporal. But it does emphatically subordinate it. Heaven is the Christian's Mother Country, 'the heart's true home'; and earth is at best (in St. Paul's words) 'a colony'.

It will be evident that the Christian doctrine of God (the Divine Note) and of Man (the Personal Note) carries with it as an inevitable corollary the immortal quality and the infinite value of the human soul (the Otherworldly Note). The object of the love of God cannot be the victim of death. When the eternal note is lost man is dwarfed and the grandeur of his vocation is stripped from it. The Christian ethic is a religious ethic with an otherworldly hunger at the heart of it. Its central truth is that man's true destiny is only achieved in communion with God in a life eternal. *Visio Dei, hominis vita*. This, I repeat, does not imply a callous or lazy neglect of earthly conditions. What it does mean is to look at them from above, *sub specie aeternitatis*.

Here, as always, Christianity by its preservation of the proportions of truth, lays itself open to misunderstanding. The short cut, the over-simplification, is so much more dramatic and plausible than the long, deep view.

There are too many little books which suggest that if men would accept the Christian way of life we should all be content and comfortable. Even if this were true, it is a degradation of the Gospel. We must carefully distinguish between objects and consequences. There are social benefits which must always tend to follow in the wake of Christianity, but they come as by-products. They are not the aim or object of our religion even though they may be the consequences of it. Religion may serve earthly purposes better than any secular inspiration can do. In Percy Ainsworth's phrase: 'All the really precious things in our earthly heritage are found in the track of a band of pilgrims.' Even so, these benefits are incidental. Religion can serve human needs, but it cannot be bent to human needs without being broken. A vivid sense of the reality of the unseen and eternal (with the corollary of Judgement)

does not reduce human life to insignificance. It gives it a profounder meaning and value. This is the teaching of Jesus.

The sacrificial devotion of Christians through the centuries is no earth-born plant. Indeed, if the immortal hope be surrendered, the Christian ethic is no longer justifiable. St. Paul was not a man whose career was inspired by fear of punishment or hope of reward. Nevertheless he did not shrink from asserting that 'if in this life only we have hoped in Christ we are of all men most pitiable'. 'If the dead rise not, why do we stand in jeopardy every hour?' Why bear an immeasurable burden of pain? The New Testament never conceals that the whole structure of Christianity stands or falls by this hypothesis. Remove the sanctions of eternity from our life and Montaigne's common-sense Epicureanism is the only logical creed. If there is nothing up there to climb for we had better never have begun to climb at all. Why climb into oblivion? To agonize for the Ideal, to know Christ 'in the fellowship of His sufferings', if the Ideal is a mirage and Christ a deluded enthusiast, is heroic folly—*c'est magnifique, mais ce n'est pas la guerre*.

If the grave ends all, martyrdom is but sublime megalomania. An Oxford professor has recently criticized Thomas More's 'unyielding obstinacy'. Why should a gifted man in the prime of life go voluntarily to the scaffold? His critic comments: 'He fell back, of course, as they all do, upon his certainty with regard to the next world—a weak position where the facts do not warrant such certainty. It is not common sense to stake so much upon a hypothesis.' The Oxford don is quite right. It isn't common sense. But when a man like More declared that 'a man might lose his head, and have no harm', he was not talking the language of a sceptical worldling but of a Christian. He was a Defender of the Faith.

IV. THE SOCIAL NOTE—TO SERVE THE PRESENT AGE

Having established the first and great commandment, Wesley made it impossible for his people to forget the second. There are two commandments, not one. To substitute either for the other is to empty both of significance. 'What God hath joined.' The late Dr. Horton told the writer that, in his judgement, Wesley was the sanest of the great religious leaders. Neither his followers nor his opponents have appreciated his extraordinary hold upon the symmetry of Christian truth. Newman was content to limit religion to the relations between 'the two and two only supreme and luminously self-evident beings, myself and my Creator'. To Wesley, this was incomplete. 'The second is like unto it.' If all souls are objects of absolute value to God, we cannot deny that they must also be of absolute value to one another, whenever and wherever they meet. There is no need to dwell upon Methodist achievements in the fields of education, humanitarian effort, and social reform. A sense of social responsibility is an integral part of the Wesleyan heritage. 'Ye shall in no wise see my face except your brother be with you.'

Neither self-centred pietism nor secular philanthropy can suffice. All life and service are inspired by the love of God shed abroad in the heart. Wesley was too sound a Christian and too good an Englishman to belittle the human and moral consequences of the Faith. He summoned his followers to be not only

godly but good, and expected them to be the most generous, disciplined, and public-spirited of men.

A STRICT ACCOUNT TO GIVE

A cogent answer to those who accuse religion of being 'a soft option'! It certainly proved a most costly passion to Wesley, both before and after his conversion. After Aldersgate Street there was a relaxing of tension, but assuredly no diminution of zeal, toil and sacrifice. His own example teaches that being 'born again' has a manward as well as a Godward side. There has been a defective Christianity which has emphasized 'getting right with God', but has maintained a pessimistic or indifferent attitude toward social duty. Non-Christians have the right to condemn the spiritualized worldliness which contrives to unite an ostentatious cultivation of religious grace with a determined enjoyment of worldly advantage. 'Ye must be born again.' 'Yes,' Wesley would reply, 'but it must be a real re-birth.' Religion must prove its virtue not only in saving a man from stealing or adultery, murder or sabbath-breaking—it must deliver him also from selfish prejudice, from pride, the lust of domination, and the greed of gain. *The Methodist Marseillaise* forbids our construing religion into a refuge from the concrete problems of economic and political life. Such detachment, in the interests of a spurious spirituality, is treason against the religion of the Incarnation.

Nevertheless, Wesley taught that the categories of sin and holiness go deeper than the recipes for social reconstruction. A socialist England would be a poor substitute for a Christian England. A true conversion is a more drastic and far-reaching experience than the devotees of socialism or individualistic pietism have realized. Today the emphasis is upon social justice; in their zeal for the fruits men tend to forget the roots. There is a righteousness which is as much more than social, as social is more than individual. Wesley went deeper down than wrongs; he penetrated to sin, the source of wrongs. Nowadays men are more affected by suffering than by sin; there is more compassion than conscience; more sentimentality than spirituality. Redemption does not lie this way.

We Christians do not complain of the superficial views and methods of secular reformers. Their *métier* is not ours. Wesley forces us back upon reality. No one ever realized more profoundly the inadequacy of changing organization, law, system, even conduct, without changing man's inmost heart. The effective sympathy of man for man has historically sprung from the Grace and Pity of God. (The Stoics professed a fine humanism, but it was only an idea. It could not translate itself into action.) The love of man for man owes more to the Grace of the Cross than to any other influence. Nothing but 'the fullness of Christ' can cope with the moral tragedy of the race. What is social ardour to live upon after a few disillusioning generations?

Let H. G. Wells supply an answer.

One cannot but regret that even Christian ministers, in despair of spiritual forces, seem to pin their faith to external organization and the compulsion of Law and Force. Totalitarianism is the final proof of spiritual bankruptcy. The inspirations of Christianity are thereby declared to be impotent or inadequate.

In his *Histoire du peuple Anglais*, Halévy asserts that the world is the scene of a duel between the two most influential characters of modern history—John

Wesley and Karl Marx. Wesley vanquished Voltaire; will he defeat the anti-Christ of the twentieth century? On the one hand a full, vital Christianity; on the other, revolutionary violence aggravated by devouring racial resentment. The faces of the two men are an indication of their gospel. Wesley stands for Love in its deepest and most practical aspect (cf. his dying words: 'Give my sermon on the Love of God to everybody'); Marx is hatred incarnate. His socialist biographer confesses that 'he loved little and hated enormously—especially his fellow socialists'. Can an evil tree bring forth good fruit? We believe that the Marxian doctrine of revolutionary terror and civil war must breed the very passions which are fatal to any real fraternity. It is the urgent duty of Christians to show a more excellent way. Are not we often shamed by the devotion of Communists to their creed? They exhibit many of the signs of conversion—changed habits, personality centred and integrated, serene confidence, dauntless courage, the dynamic force of a fixed purpose, a faith to live for and to die for, their lives are often raised to a thrilling and romantic intensity. Can it be that atheistic materialism is a judgement upon Laodicean Christianity? How disconcerting that an inferior gospel should inspire a superior devotion. Communists are not disheartened by their small numbers or repeated defeats.

Moreover, we are challenged not only by the exploits of tiny communist minorities; the outstanding thinkers of our day—Spengler, Berdyaev, Unamuno, Mumford, Toynbee, Heard—with one accord insist that the one and only hope of averting unparalleled disaster lies in the possibility of religious renewal.

Man has been a dazzling success in the field of non-human nature, in the realm of intellect, invention, and 'know-how'; but a tragic failure in the things of the spirit. On the testimony of the world's great laymen, some of them non-Christians, religious revival is the one thing needful.

In his closing pages, Toynbee writes: 'The swift succession of catastrophic events, on a steeply mounting gradient, inevitably inspires a dark doubt about our future, and this doubt threatens to undermine our faith and hope at a critical eleventh hour which calls for the utmost exertion of these saving spiritual faculties.' He reminds us of Bunyan's pilgrim in the City of Destruction, with a great burden on his back, breaking out weeping with a lamentable cry: 'What shall I do?'

What response is Christian going to make?

'If the answer depended on nobody but Christian himself our knowledge of the uniformity of human nature might incline us to predict that his imminent destiny was death in this doomed city. But we know that he was not left entirely to his own resources. *He was saved by his encounter with Evangelist.*'

This miracle has happened before more than once in history. In the eighteenth century Evangelist's name was John Wesley. According to Halévy the crucial issue is whether the defiant strains of *The Red Flag* can be silenced and superseded by the nobler music of *The Methodist Marseillaise*. And this can only happen if the sons of Wesley realize that the Good Tidings entrusted to them are the truths by which men live, and without which they surely die.

F. BROMPTON HARVEY

SOLITARINESS AND COMMUNITY IN RELIGION IN WHITEHEAD'S PHILOSOPHY

THE STATEMENT that 'Religion is what the individual does with his own solitariness'¹ is one of the best known of Whitehead's many aphorisms, and it is often quoted as his definition of religion. But nothing could be more misleading than this statement taken out of its context. One must read and re-read *Religion in the Making* to understand what Whitehead means by this, and it can only fully be understood in the light of his whole philosophy of organism. It is true to say that Whitehead does regard religion as something supremely individualistic, and solitariness as fundamental to it, but this is not to deny the communal and universal aspect of it. We need to keep in mind that other less-known aphorism: 'The topic of religion is Individuality in Community.'²

The early Greek philosophers said that the universe was both one and many. The same problem has been faced many times since then with many varied results, divergent in detail but broadly divisible into two classes—monistic and pluralistic theories. In his philosophy of organism, Whitehead suggests a solution which attempts to do justice to both viewpoints. For Whitehead the problem is that of the smaller organisms within the bigger organism, the microcosm within the macrocosm. For him the world is both one and many. His view of the universe is essentially aesthetic, and the importance of Aesthetics for Whitehead lies in the vivid grasp of the interdependence of the one and the many. He views the universe as a picture, seeing it as a whole, yet at the same time seeing the many particular entities. Just as the alteration of the slightest detail may alter the whole picture, so a change in any particular entity affects the whole universe. A man's religion is his attempt to reconcile his own individuality with the universe in which he finds himself. So as man's knowledge of the physical world is enlarged, his religion must develop. As McTaggart says: 'Religion has always implied a belief in some fundamental harmony between the claims of our own nature and the facts of the universe.'³

Whitehead is opposed to any theory which holds religion to be primarily a social phenomenon, at the same time admitting the importance of social facts, collective enthusiasms, revivals, bibles, codes of behaviour, etc. These are necessary because there is no such thing as absolute independence. He would agree, too, that in its origins religion was primarily social, especially in the stages of ritual and myth. Myth encourages thought, and thought leads on to belief; but it is not until we reach the stage of rationalism,⁴ or self-conscious reflection, that the true nature of religion as individual emerges. Thus belief and rationalization are well established before solitariness is seen to be the heart of religious importance, yet at the same time he says that the origin of rational religion is in solitariness. At first sight these two statements seem confusing. Whitehead would probably say that as a psychological fact it was man's realization of his individuality that drove him on to rationalize his religion; and so side by side with man's growing sense of solitariness there came the rationalization of religion. It was only later, however, that man discerned solitariness to

¹ A. N. Whitehead, *Religion in the Making*, p. 6.

² *ibid.*, p. 76.

³ John McTaggart, *Some Dogmas of Religion*, p. 9.

⁴ There is nothing deprecatory about Whitehead's use of the terms, 'rationalism' or 'rationalization'. It is the application of reason to irrational ritual or myth.

be the essence (and not merely the origin) of rational religion. Up to a certain stage of his development, a communal religion satisfies man, but not after he has realized his loneliness in what often seems a hostile universe. 'All collective emotions leave untouched the awful ultimate fact, which is the human being consciously alone with itself for its own sake.'⁵ In the religious struggle, man realizes two things: firstly his utter solitariness; and secondly, the fact that he is in a universe which is wholly other than himself. He has to live in this universe and in some way he has to reconcile these two realities.

When a man realizes his individuality and his utter solitariness, then it is that the age of martyrs dawns. Whitehead illustrates this process by reference to the Hebrew prophets. These men were in revolt against the cult and stressed the individuality of religious experience. 'The individual became the religious unit in the place of the community; the tribal dance lost its importance compared with the individual prayer; and for the few, the individual prayer merged into justification through individual insight.'⁶ Up to a point the community can progress as a community, but the really exciting things begin to happen when the individual breaks away from the community and strikes out for himself. He realizes his independence; he has become an individual.

'What the individual does with his solitariness' does not mean how an individual spends his lonely moments of solitude. The man who enjoys most solitude may not be religious at all. Rather, religion is man's reaction to the realization of his utter solitariness. The deeply religious men of the world are those who have realized their utter solitariness and have found release in various ways. Prometheus chained to the rock, Mahomet in the desert, the meditating Buddha and Jesus on the Cross were all men who knew this utter solitariness. We might add to these Joan of Arc, whose words in Bernard Shaw's play give expression to the sense of solitariness experienced by the religious person. 'Do you think you can frighten me by telling me that I am alone? France is alone; and God is alone; and what is my loneliness before the loneliness of my country and my God? I see now that the loneliness of God is His strength: what would He be if He listened to your jealous little counsels? Well, my loneliness shall be my strength too: it is better to be alone with God: His friendship will not fail me, nor His counsel, nor His love.' Joan's solitariness was relieved by the knowledge of God's friendship, but some in their most bitter moments have felt forsaken even by God. It was such a sense of utter loneliness that Jesus experienced on the Cross.

Although the religious struggle is supremely an individual experience, it still remains a struggle with the world. It is the struggle of the individual in a world of chance and change to find something permanent and lasting through which he can interpret the transitory world. It is the attempt to find permanence in flux. Whitehead⁷ illustrates this by reference to the well-known hymn 'Abide with me'. The later lines of the hymn bring out the point admirably.

Change and decay in all around I see,
O Thou who changest not, abide with me.

Job faced the same problem. Confronted with the loss of all his earthly possessions, he looks to his friends for comfort and finds none. The dogmas of the

⁵ *Religion in the Making*, p. 6.

⁶ *ibid.*, p. 25.

⁷ *Process and Reality*, p. 296.

time prove no consolation. He feels cut off even from God. 'O that I knew where I might find Him!' is his cry. He wrestles with his sense of solitariness to find peace at last. In the words of Peake: 'He has become a man of broken and contrite heart, penitent and self-loathing, who, because he knows himself to have nothing and to deserve nothing, can most readily cast himself upon God, whose wisdom and omnipotence no longer crush but uphold and uplift him.'⁸ Although living amongst a people who held no certain beliefs in a life after death, he could reach out toward a belief in the survival of the soul. He had reached a synthesis, however unsatisfactory it may seem to us, of the claims of his own nature and the universe. In his own experience he had passed through the three stages described by Whitehead: 'The transition from God the void to God the enemy, and from God the enemy to God the companion.'⁹

Hebrew and Christian thought find salvation from solitariness in God. The story of Jacob wrestling with God is typical of the Hebrew religious attitude. Buddhist thought, on the other hand, seeks release from solitariness by an escape from individuality itself. For Buddhism regards all evil as inherently bound up with individuality. Yet in spite of this, the attainment of Nirvana is still an individual achievement to be attained by individual asceticism and devotion. Others again, including some Christians, find release through community, a Church, or a State. But if individuality is sacrificed this may be retrogression rather than salvation for, as Whitehead reminds us, 'religion in its decay sinks back into sociability'.¹⁰ It is possible thus to gain the world at the price of one's soul.

Because solitariness is the core of religion, religion must be inward and personal. It is 'the force of belief cleansing the inward parts'. It is 'the art and theory of the internal life of man'. If it is an art it must have a co-ordinating effect on the inner life of the individual. It must integrate his personality. As William James would say, it reunites the divided soul. Its product should be individual worth of character.¹¹ This is inherent in Whitehead's theory of value; in so far as the integration achieved is greater, so will the value of the individual be higher, and his contribution to the world greater. This philosophy of organism expresses the same truth as Paul's theology of organism which is implicit in his constant use of the metaphor of the Body of Christ. The more the foot is a foot, the greater the service that will be rendered to the body. If the foot tries to be a hand or tries to merge itself into the body, then its value as a foot will be lost to itself and the body. Through individual religious experience lies world salvation. Writing of the sociological significance of the Methodist revival, Whitehead says: 'The Methodist preachers aimed at saving men's souls in the next world, but incidentally they gave a new direction to emotions energizing in this world.'¹²

Along with this 'inward' aspect of religion, Whitehead stresses the importance of individual insight and intuition. He tells us that the relevance of religious concepts can only be discerned in moments of insight.¹³ The prophetic message is based on individual intuition.¹⁴ He further points out, that the 'reported sayings of Christ are not formularized thought. They are descriptions of direct insight.'¹⁵ Of Methodism he says: 'The movement was singularly devoid of new

⁸ *Century Bible*, Job, p. 20.

¹² *Adventures of Ideas*, Chap. 2.

⁹ *Religion in the Making*, p. 6.

¹³ *Religion in the Making*, p. 21.

¹⁰ *ibid.*, p. 13.

¹⁴ *ibid.*, p. 25.

¹¹ *ibid.*, p. 7.

¹⁵ *ibid.*, p. 46.

ideas, and singularly rich in vivid feelings. . . . In an age of aristocracy in England, the Methodists appealed to the direct intuitions of working men and of retail traders concerned with working men. In America they appealed to the toiling, isolated groups of pioneers. They brought hope, fear, emotional release, spiritual insight.¹⁶

Finally, Whitehead sums up the religious problem in this way: 'Religion is founded on the concurrence of three allied concepts in one moment of self-consciousness, concepts whose separate relationships to fact and whose mutual relations to each other are only to be settled jointly by some *direct intuition* into the ultimate character of the universe. These concepts are:

1. That of the value of the individual for itself.
2. That of the value of the diverse individuals of the world for each other.
3. That of the value of the objective world which is a community derivative from the inter-relations of its component individuals, and also necessary for the existence of each of these individuals.'¹⁷

This third concept includes for Whitehead the person of God. Here again we see the importance of 'direct intuition into the ultimate character of the universe'.

Throughout the works of Whitehead there are what have been called flashes of penetrating insight. But these must be interpreted in the light of his general ideas. So in religion there must be a check on individual insight and intuition. The world would be chaos if it were a world of individuals, each with his own particular insight into the nature of things. So reason must safeguard the objectivity of religion.¹⁸ Man cannot find salvation in a religion which may prove a subjective phantasy. The individual man, like any other 'actual entity' in Whitehead's philosophy, is inevitably bound up with the rest of the universe and will never achieve the fullest value until he has found some attitude to the universe which satisfies the demands of his own being and of the universe. If a religion is to be satisfying it must take account of the scientific description of the universe as well as the inward attitude of the soul.

Religion, as we have seen, begins with community. Then there is a point when the individual emerges and realizes his individuality and his utter loneliness. Finally, because he is an individual *in* the world, there is a return from solitariness to community. So Whitehead says: 'The world is a scene of solitariness in community.'¹⁹ Indeed, without community the individual is not truly an individual. 'Every entity is in its nature social and requires society in order to exist. In fact, the society for each entity, actual or ideal, is the all-inclusive universe, including its ideal forms.'²⁰ So it is with the individual person. 'The individual is formative of society, the society is formative of the individual.'²¹ It is precisely the same relation that holds between the part and the whole in the physical world. The individual has much to gain from community. So Goethe was bound up with the Weimar of his day, Shakespeare with Elizabethan England, Socrates with fifth-century Athens. The individual is what he is because of his reaction to his environment, while his environment is what it is and not something slightly different because of its reaction to his individuality.

¹⁶ *Adventures of Ideas*, Chap. 2.

¹⁹ *ibid.*, p. 76.

²⁰ *ibid.*, p. 94.

¹⁷ *Religion in the Making*, p. 48.

²¹ *ibid.*, p. 75.

¹⁸ *ibid.*, p. 53.

In Whitehead's view there is nothing, not even God, which requires nothing but itself in order to exist.²²

The return from solitariness to community may be illustrated again from the early Methodists. Salvation was stressed as a personal and individual experience. Their method was to arouse in their hearers a sense of sin. A man must feel his utter loneliness and separation from God. Then they offered salvation. Assurance as preached by the Methodists can only come by a direct intuition. But though the struggle and rebirth were individual, the converts needed community for their building up in the faith. So along with evangelism goes the class meeting. Those who have been through the individual struggle need the confirmation and assurance that only community can offer. The return from solitariness to community finds expression also in the formation of dogma and the institution of sacraments, in which the individuals find common outward expression of their personal inward experience. It is when the outward expression overpowers the inward experience, and when community completely displaces solitariness that religion loses its value. Yet because there must be some outward expression the risk must be accepted.

Whitehead says that the problem facing the world is not how to produce great men, but how to produce great societies;²³ but on his own showing he would have to say that in the end great societies can only be produced by great men. But his point is important. The truly great man is not necessarily the man who stands head and shoulders above his contemporaries, but the man who can *lay down his life* for his friends. The type of the Kingdom of God is not Carlyle's hero, but the little child. The great society might not be marked by a great deal of what we call genius, but it would be marked by what Christians have called 'love of the brethren'. There is no clear-cut way between individualism and community. Both are necessary. So it is with religion. Neither solitary piety nor membership of a religious group brings eternal life. We are back to the Christian paradox. 'What doth it profit a man to gain the whole world and forfeit his soul? For what should a man give in exchange for his soul?' But this is not the whole truth: 'For whosoever would save his life shall lose it; and whosoever shall lose his life for my sake and the gospel's shall save it.' Whitehead's philosophy of organism restates this paradox. As an individual 'loses his soul' or merges his claims with those of the objective universe, so he truly becomes an individual. When he deliberately cuts himself off from community, he loses his individuality. It is true that he still exists as a branch cut off from a tree exists, but life has no meaning apart from community. Because this is true on a grand scale, Whitehead can describe religion as World Loyalty.²⁴ The orphan child is utterly alone in the world, but through religion he finds that the Creator is his Father and the World is his home.

BERNARD E. JONES

²² *ibid.*, p. 94.

²³ *Science and the Modern World*, p. 237.

²⁴ *Religion in the Making*, p. 49.

COMMUNISM IN INDIA

With Particular Reference to its Growth in Hyderabad State

JUST BEFORE I left India in the early months of this year a friend of mine said to me, apropos of the rapid advance of the Chinese Communists: 'I give India five years before she goes the way of China.'

At a time when the Western nations are becoming increasingly concerned at the growth of Communism, it behoves us to realize that not only has Communism overrun the greater part of China, not only is it rampant in parts of Europe which are much nearer home than China, but it is also increasing by leaps and bounds in India.

I am not competent to write from first-hand experience about conditions in the whole sub-continent. India is a much bigger country than most people realize, consisting, as it does, not only of a large peninsula protruding into the Indian Ocean, but also of enormous land masses which extend far to the north, west, and east of the actual peninsula. However, one travels a good deal about the country and one can glean fairly accurate information from those who live in other parts, and in the hill stations one meets missionaries and business men who may come from anywhere between the Persian Gulf and Singapore, between Pakistan and Cape Comorin. Of latter years the story has been the same from all parts—Communism is growing, in some areas rapidly, in others not so rapidly. All the Indian railways have been dislocated with strikes within the past two or three years; the famous Tata steel works in Jamshedpur likewise. Bombay port, Madras port, Calcutta trams and buses, Madura mills, Madras mills, Delhi sweepers, Bangalore municipal clerks, and so on *ad nauseam*, all have been involved in strikes over labour conditions or rates of pay within recent months, and the cause has ultimately been traced to Communist influence.

Unfortunately, India provides an ideal breeding-ground for Communism. Hinduism with its caste system teaches that man is predestined to live in various strata or grades of society. From the Brahmin at the top, the *elite*, the divine, the twice-born, right down to the poorest outcaste—man is ordained of God to live at a certain level and he cannot better his lot or rise to any higher level. Beneath the four main castes or strata there are millions of outcastes, untouchable, beyond the pale, whose very presence brings pollution. Call them by Mahatma Gandhi's name of 'Harijan' if you will, but though the name means 'People of God', to the Hindus they are still outcastes.

It is amongst these low caste and outcaste people that the Communist movement is spreading today. Given a fair chance the outcaste can do as well as, and indeed better than, the caste man; travel is becoming increasingly popular, and as train fares are so low even the poor outcaste can sometimes afford to visit a town where he can see a picture or listen to a radio which give him an insight into a bigger world than he has ever dreamed of before. He realizes that all the world does not live in squalor and poverty. He learns that many people take for granted such things as electricity, gas, roads, a postal system, a railway system, hospitals, schools, and all the other amenities of

civilized life of which he may have heard but which he has certainly never dreamed of being provided with himself.

Many of India's outcastes served in His Majesty's Forces during the recent war and saw places far beyond the narrow confines of their own villages; their eyes have been opened and their desires awakened. A year ago I was camping in a remote village in the southern part of Hyderabad State when two Indian soldiers came to see me. They were lads whose homes were in that village and who had been educated in the school where I was at that time working. They had both joined up in the early years of the war. One had been through the North African campaigns and had finished up in Italy. The other had travelled widely through India, had fought in the Burma campaigns, and was home on leave from Japan. Later they were both demobilized and returned to their home village to settle down to farming, but conditions were so bad compared to what they had seen in the last five years that one went off to Madras to seek a living there, and the other joined the Communists with the intention of helping to put right the injustices and the corruption of village life.

Many Communists are men who saw service in many lands. In the Forces they were treated as men. They were trained, they were given responsibility, they were clothed, fed, if they were ill they were cared for, and they were well paid. How can such men be expected to return to village conditions as they are in Hyderabad and in other parts of India?

The villagers are restless and it is this restlessness that the Communists are so cleverly playing on in India today. Perhaps nowhere is it more true to say: 'You have nothing to lose but your chains.'

So far I have been generalizing and I must admit that much of my information comes from what others have told me, but of one part of India I can speak from personal knowledge and that part is Hyderabad State. What is true of Hyderabad State is probably equally true of other parts of India. (May I say that the greater part of my work is with the village people and that of necessity I have to know their language. Hence it has been possible to get closer to them, their ways of life, their thoughts and feelings, than it ever is for journalists, novelists, Government officers, and the like.)

I have already mentioned the caste system. In Hyderabad as elsewhere that system obtains, though if anything it is worse there than in what used to be British India. The poor are so very poor. The outcaste are so very much less than the dust. For generations the rulers of the State have been Moslems. They have exacted their dues and taxes, and, as always happens, the people who ultimately pay are the villagers. The nobles, the lords, the senior officials, must all have their revenues. If the crops fail, if prices rise, the aristocracy must be the last to suffer. Nor can the lesser officials be expected to do without their 'perquisites'. If money is needed for the rulers, for the court, for the landlords, for the Government, then the villager must find it. It is he who must give more and eat less, who must work harder for still less pay.

Curiously enough, one problem has been shared alike by India and Eire—the problem of the absentee landlord—and perhaps that is why the two countries have so much sympathy for each other. In Hyderabad especially the big landlords live in Hyderabad City or Secunderabad, and sometimes even outside the State, but they expect their dues to be paid even though they

themselves never go near their estates and certainly never spend anything on alleviating the conditions of their tenants. Not all the landlords are Moslems, but even the Hindus who have big estates expect their fellow countrymen to live like beasts in the villages in order to provide the joys of life for their caste overlords.

In 1939 there was a disastrous famine in the region north of the River Godavery. The rains had failed completely, the river itself was practically dry, the hundreds of little tanks (or reservoirs) were dry, there were few wells which had any water. A colleague and I toured the whole area and made detailed reports of conditions as they were in the villages, which reports we duly sent to the Government Department concerned. The local District Collector was at the same time sending in his reports (I happen to know that he hardly ever stirred outside his compound during the whole of that awful time, so that his information was almost entirely second-hand), and these reports mentioned the fact that there was indeed 'some scarcity'. Eventually the Government decided that there was something curious about the conflicting reports, and a senior and trustworthy officer was sent to investigate. After a few days in the villages (together with the District Collector who had at last to go out touring willy-nilly) he remarked that, if anything, we had underestimated the seriousness of the famine and it was certainly a question of far more than mere scarcity. Relief schemes organized by the Government, but entrusted to us to run, were soon put into operation. Now it so happened that at the time the daughter of a local landlord was married. Thousands of pounds were spent on feasting and entertaining hundreds of guests, but when we approached the landlord for a subscription to our famine relief fund—a fund to help not merely Christians, but any who were in need—he would give us nothing. Why? Because it was nothing to him that the ignorant down-trodden slaves in the villages should die for lack of food.

Illiteracy is rampant throughout India. There are few villages with schools anywhere and there are still fewer in Hyderabad. Where you find a school it is intended for the children of the caste people only and not for the children of the outcastes. Poverty is terrible and quite indescribable. Disease is incredible in its variety, persistence, and ubiquity.

Yet already things are not what they were ten years ago. Illiteracy is not quite so rampant in Hyderabad. Some of the village people can read and they can all listen. They are asking why a few absentee landlords should own all the land; why the villager should be expected to live at a lower level than that of the beasts of the field; why he should ever be uncertain as to whence the next meal will come; why there are no hospitals to alleviate his sufferings; why he should be robbed and hoodwinked by legions of unscrupulous and dishonest officials.

During the past two years the Hyderabad Government instituted a system of grain levy in order to provide food for the towns. In theory this was an excellent idea, for it took from the farmers their surplus, gave the farmers a good price for that surplus, and ensured a supply of food for those who spend their lives in the towns. Like many theories, however, it looked better on paper than it proved in practice. What really happened was that the man who sweated in the sun, shivered in the cold, toiled through mud and wind and rain to produce

the grain, had the fruit of his labours taken off him to supply, not only the townfolk, but also every petty and not-so-petty official from the village headman upwards. Every official had to have his commission, and even though the Government Department concerned got its quota, in the end it meant that the peasant lost practically all he had grown and then had to buy what he needed to eat at high rates in a ration centre which might be thirty miles away, and where he could only buy grain enough for a day at a time.

On the other hand, the big landlords so arranged it that their own assessment of the levy was often severely curtailed. This was done by getting local officials to write down a very much smaller amount of grain than that which you actually had stored, and this they were not reluctant to do for a consideration. Having paid your levy, you thereupon sold the balance of your grain in the local black market or took it over the border into Madras Presidency and sold it there.

So much for the background of events as they were during last year.

A few years ago a general restlessness became apparent in the villages of south Hyderabad. While there is poverty and backwardness in that area, the people as a whole are of a different type from those in other parts of the State. They are much more independent, more intelligent, and have a good deal of contact with Madras Presidency, which has always been one of the more enlightened parts of the country.

People began to ask questions. Congress workers started touring the villages trying to stir up revolt against the Government and promising better conditions of life if only the Moslem yoke could be thrown off. For some time the Congress Party was banned in the State and it looked as though this restlessness would die down when many of the Congress leaders fled to other parts of the country. To our astonishment this did not happen, but rather did the unrest increase and spread. Eventually we discovered that the reason was none other than that Communist agents had taken the place of the Congress workers, agents who were far more aggressive, better organized, and far better equipped in every way.

The Communist agents not only made promises, they got on with the job. They denounced the landlords, the corrupt officials, and they preached against the appalling conditions in the villages. In some cases landlords were murdered and their lands and cattle were distributed to those who owed nothing. At one time there was hardly a village in our area where any kind of Government official was to be found. Those who could escape did so, some to Hyderabad City, many to places of safety without the State.

Thousands flocked to join the Communist ranks. The early leaders were men from outside the State. Later local leaders were trained. Membership was for the most part confined to the Madiga caste, the very lowest of the out-castes in that part of India, and also to a few from the Mala caste, also out-castes, but slightly less beyond the pale than the Madigas. They were well trained, many wore uniform, many carried modern arms (where these arms came from I have never been able to discover, but certainly they were not all stolen from British military camps), they travelled light and mostly by night.

While I hold no brief for the doctrine of Communism, it was hard not to have a good deal of sympathy for the Communists in our area. Their attitude to us

was that, in so far as we too were trying to uplift the villager, we were doing the same kind of work as they themselves and therefore, so long as we did not interfere with them, they would not interfere with us. While this is satisfactory to a certain extent, it must be remembered that the Communists are not yet in full control of that area and their policy is still to win men by persuasion and not by brute force. At no time did I come across any cases of village people being molested by the Communists, unless it was a corrupt official. Where it was proved that a villager had given information to the police which had led to the capture of Communists, then those who had given such information were summarily dealt with. It is only fair to say that the Communists helped us to keep our schools and hospital going on certain occasions by making grain available when rationing had broken down and the Government were unable to provide us with food.

The Communists laid it down that no grain was to be given up to the Government levy, that no grain was to be transported from one village to another, that those who had helped to grow it should have the benefit of it and should be able to buy it at controlled rates. At that time the Government controlled rate was Rs.400 per measure. The Communists controlled it at Rs.240 per measure and even then there was a profit for the man who had grown it. So far as possible profiteering was cut out and prices were brought down to about half of what they had been. For instance, the price of country tiles (for roofing) prior to 1939 had been Rs.2 per 1,000. During the war the price rose until in 1947 it was Rs.18 per 1,000. The Communists brought it down to Rs.7-8 in 1948. The question naturally comes to mind: How were these new prices enforced? The answer is that there were so many Communists in that area that no one dared to ask any higher price or any other price than was laid down by the Party.

If officials, or even villagers, persisted in trying to charge high prices in spite of warnings by the Communists, such people were warned in person that they were being watched. If they still persisted a second warning was given. If they took no notice a third warning was not given—they were dealt with and a red flag was placed over the grave. Their movable property was distributed to the poor, and their buildings destroyed.

Of course, all this was highly pleasing to the poor and down-trodden, but at the same time highly illegal in the eyes of the Government of Hyderabad, who could hardly be expected to allow it to pass unnoticed. Police raids became frequent, and at the beginning of 1948 the military joined in to help put an end to the Communists.

The difficulty was that there were few roads, only one railway in that area (and most of the trouble was far from that railway), and no telegraph system into the interior. Lorries could be used to transport troops, but the noise of heavy vehicles moving slowly over rough country could be heard for miles, and when the troops finally reached some village where Communist activity was suspected the Communists were either innocently working in the fields, eagerly crowding round the troops to hear their advice and swearing that they knew nothing whatever of any Communists, or else were a long way off in a place of safety. Even where many of the villagers were not active members of the movement they were reluctant to give information about those who had

helped them to Government servants who had not. Indeed, at that time many of the villagers were in a desperate plight. Everyone in an Indian village knows everything about everyone else and, of course, those who were not Communists knew who were. If they were to give information to the police they would certainly be killed by the Communists; if they were to withhold information from the police they might well be shot—and sometimes were. Hence it was that eventually the Government forces became exasperated and where information was withheld or proved to be incorrect the village where such information had been sought or incorrectly given was burned down. I have seen many villages completely destroyed for this reason, and one night I watched a big village burning only three miles from my bungalow. It had been fired by the police because they suspected that the inhabitants knew more concerning the whereabouts of a certain Communist leader than they would divulge.

The result of such terrorizing was that people became more and more sympathetic to the Communists. Finally, it was no longer a question of a few bands wandering about proclaiming Communism, but the whole countryside was actively sympathetic. This was before the invasion of Hyderabad State by the Indian forces in September 1948, when conditions were absolutely deplorable both in town and village and when thousands of slightly interested village youths and maidens became zealous members of the Communist Party, doing all they could to prevent Government forces from penetrating into the villages, destroying roads, bridges, railways, all kinds of Government buildings in the remoter parts, shooting up and thus stopping local bus services, raiding police posts by night, overpowering the police and stealing their rifles. We used to smile when the Indian papers announced, with no small jubilation, that the Communist menace in the Nalgonda Taluq (county) was under control as four or five Communist leaders had been caught after 'an intensive comb-out' of a certain area. In that certain area we knew that there were thousands of Communists, hundreds of villages, four leaders to each village, other leaders for groups of villages, others for districts, for a county, and so on. And each leader had his deputy in case he himself were caught!

It must be understood that it was far more than a case of a mere village rabble revolting against oppression. The whole thing was very highly organized. After the Indian Union troops invaded the State last September they set out to destroy Communism in our area. More than once military commanders have complained to me that despite the utmost secrecy their plans have often been known to the Communists, who have been able to take appropriate evasive action.

Further, the Communists are men with an ideal, a purpose. It is true that many of the members are in for what they can get. There has been a good deal of unofficial looting in the name of the Communists, but where this has happened the Communists themselves have usually caught the offenders and have punished them severely, sometimes with death. As against that kind of thing, I know of many local leaders who have given up a great deal for their beliefs. Many of these leaders are not the poorest of the poor, but are men who once had some land and wealth. These they have divided up amongst those who had none. They have often had to take to the jungle and live the life of outlaws,

pursued by the police, the military, and traitors amongst their own followers, until such time as they have been able to get out of the State. The movement is not by any means confined to men. An undergraduette was one of the chief leaders until she was betrayed and caught by the military last December. Many village women have joined the Party. It has sometimes happened that both a man and his wife would have to take to the jungle; their house and property was destroyed by the police, and they themselves would be pursued from hiding-place to hiding-place until they finally managed to escape or were caught. Yet, in spite of such hardships, there is no lack of leaders. They are men of courage, of resource, and they have a vision of India being freed from tyranny—not the tyranny of British imperialism but the tyranny of their own people.

They are men of action, and they are willing to work hard. Even after the highly trained Indian Union troops had come into the State and were actually posted in our area, within two nights a stretch of road thirty miles long between our station and our hospital was almost completely destroyed. Every bridge and every culvert had been broken down and at frequent intervals the road had been dug across with deep trenches. There were fifty-one demolitions in those thirty miles of road and most of the work had been done with crowbars.

Now, to those who are able to look farther than the next meal it must be obvious that there will come a day of reckoning. Once order has been restored in Hyderabad—and when I left in February (1949) the Military Government was already preparing to hand over to the Civil Administration—the matter of land which has been stolen from landlords, of cattle and property which have been confiscated, of murder, of destruction of Government buildings, will have to be settled. But what will be the end of it? Will village life in Hyderabad ever return to the old standards? I doubt it and I sincerely hope not. Village life in Hyderabad is little different from that in other parts of India, and unless the new Government improves village conditions there will be no rest now until someone else improves them. And at present that is just what the Communists are bent on doing. Communism cannot be eradicated by force; it can only be abolished by making the ground unfit for it to flourish. The villager will be loyal to whoever improves his lot and makes life a little more worth living.

I have recently received a letter from a colleague who is in the same area as myself in which he says that for the moment the Communists have been driven underground. The military forces are too strong for them. The Government are therefore jubilant and appear to have taken it for granted that the end of Communism in the State is at hand. The same attitude is apparently being taken by our own Government with regard to the situation in Malaya. Unfortunately, it is nearly always true that Government reports are given on other people's observations and not by direct contact with a situation on the part of the Government officials concerned. I know nothing of the position of affairs in Malaya, but, judging by what has happened in Hyderabad, I can well imagine that it is only for the moment that the Communists have gone underground.

India has been independent for barely two years. Hyderabad was 'liberated' less than a year ago. It is therefore hardly fair to pass judgement on what the Indian Government has or has not accomplished in so short a time. Nevertheless,

it was not very apparent that since independence anything much had even been thought of to alleviate the lot of the villager either in Hyderabad or in the rest of India. What if village conditions are not improved? What if the old injustices, the old bribery and corruption and general inefficiency, the old disregard for the villager, merely take on a new garb? What if the old nationalist India is determined to maintain the caste system? What if the old gulf between the comparatively few who are immeasurably wealthy (and who appear to be determined at all costs to retain that wealth) and the multitudes who spend life on the verge of starvation is to continue?

If village India is no better off under the new régime than under the old then it might well be that what is happening in China today will soon be happening in India. From what one hears and reads about conditions in China's villages just the same conditions pertain in India. And the villages of India are less apathetic, less prepared to be ground underfoot than they were even ten years ago. Already they have tasted some of the fruits of Communism and their appetites have been whetted for more.

What an outlook for the world if not only China but the whole Continent of Asia, as well as the greater part of Europe, were to turn to Communism for salvation!

J. LAWSON GARFORTH

EDITORIAL COMMENTS (*continued from p. 4*)

to a lower level, but deep down in man's soul are instincts which still proclaim his divine origin and his tremendous destiny. As we finished reading the record of a year of noble service, we remembered the immediate response of a few ordinary soldiers to a little group of blind children in Palestine, during a world war. Man is not only the creation of God; he is, most certainly, the potential helper of God in furthering His creation. Behind the iron curtain, and beyond the mystery of California is something more than experiments in atom-splitting. There is the personal factor which suddenly emerges, god-like, from a chaos of ideas and threats. The battle of the blind has its spiritual as well as its physical significance—and man cannot escape it. His deepest joy lies in accepting its challenge. 'Every healing action is always God's,' says Evelyn Underhill, 'but He often takes something of ours or something we think is ours to do it with—His is the power, skill, and tenderness; ours to yield up our best handkerchief for His bandages, our leisure to carry out His treatment.' To man He entrusts the healing of the world, and so lays His Cross upon our hearts.

LESLIE F. CHURCH

THE TREATMENT OF DISEASE IN NEW TESTAMENT TIMES

IN VIEW of the importance accorded to healing in the ministry of Jesus and in the mission of the apostles, it may be interesting to discuss here some contemporary healing methods. From the voluminous writings extant in Greek and Latin upon these subjects it is possible to discover both the popular and superstitious methods, and also those advocated by exponents of newer and more rational medicine. Frequently, in fact, these methods are so combined and intermingled that they are difficult for us to identify, and for many of the ancients there was probably no attempt to distinguish between them. Even in the treatise on Regimen in the *Hippocratic Corpus*, whose writers are advocating a scientific approach, we are told (IV.87) that prayer (to the pagan gods of Greece, such as Asklepios) may be useful, but must be accompanied by practical measures.

It may be objected that the sources to which at the moment we refer are chiefly Greek and Roman, and that they would therefore not necessarily apply to methods used by contemporaries of Christ in Palestine. To a very striking degree, however, the remedies for ailments common in all the coastlands of the Mediterranean resemble each other, ring the changes on a few simple expedients, and use materials which were available in all these lands or readily and frequently imported from near neighbours. Moreover, some of the more encyclopedic writers, such as Pliny the Elder, deliberately sought their material from as wide a field as possible, as well as from others whose tastes were equally eclectic. Many of the early medical men travelled from place to place in the Mediterranean world. Pythagoras, perhaps one of the more legendary figures in this profession, was reputed to have visited Egypt and various parts of Asia Minor, though he was actually a Greek who founded a school of philosophy in Italy.

Hippocrates, the father of scientific medicine and author of part of the large collection of medical writings to which his name is attached, was born in the island of Cos, near the coast of Asia Minor and within easy distance of both Rhodes and Ephesus, to mention only two localities familiar to readers of the New Testament. It was also in Cos, so we are told, that Hippocrates studied medicine. Another cogent reason for the spread of medical traditions throughout the ancient world in the New Testament period was that wherever the Roman army marched or settled there were medical orderlies, doctors, and sometimes even military hospitals of a rudimentary kind.

We may reasonably conclude, therefore, that by the first or second century A.D. the methods of the various schools of Greek physicians, together with the main drugs used, would be known and employed wherever there were trained personnel. Where medicine was merely traditional, and healing, if achieved at all, was the work of untrained practitioners; of the housewife, or the village magician, the methods also appear similar, differing only when the local herbs and other remedies were different, or when the level of culture varied considerably.

The most common diseases in the Mediterranean countries seem to have been fevers, leprosy, and other skin troubles, pneumonia, and what was vaguely

termed 'plague' or 'pestilence'. Wasting diseases, which may include tuberculosis in various forms, are also mentioned, and medical writers devote considerable attention to epilepsy and paralysis. Affections of the eye and the ear were frequently treated at the temples of Asklepios.

Let us therefore consider how the people whom Christ and His disciples healed would have fared without their intervention. To what extent would they have encountered the same methods, and to what extent would their treatment have differed? In order to answer these questions we shall take in turn the diseases which Christ and his followers treated, and examine the method of treatment which was advocated by contemporary authorities.

Before dealing with the various diseases in detail, however, it may be well to indicate one or two important factors which affect the whole subject of healing in ancient times. First, professional attention was not available to the majority of sufferers. Only in a few progressive states, chiefly in Greece and Italy, were doctors maintained by the community to attend all who required their assistance. Elsewhere, medical aid was a matter of private arrangement, doctors usually charging a fee. Some indeed charged exorbitant sums, and, in any case, trained physicians tended to establish themselves mainly in large cities where they could expect to obtain a living from their work, and where, at any rate in later days at Rome, they could maintain a surgery and receive pupils who would assist them. Secondly, the methods used in ancient times required a minimum of drugs, apparatus, and instruments. Most of the plants required for the simple prescriptions could be found in Italy, or were part of the typical vegetation of the Mediterranean basin. The herbal remedies recorded by Cato and later by Pliny and others, as well as those celebrated in the folk-lore and general literature of these lands, were based upon the use of various kinds of oil and wine, together with other products of the olive and vine; common plants such as the rose and the cabbage; and water from mineral springs or the mineral substances themselves. The long lists of ailments, often very ill-assorted, which Pliny regards as curable by a single one of his simple expedients remind us only too vividly of the advertisements for such remedies in our own day.

Even in the scientific medical schools of ancient times the idea of assisting the natural processes of healing by correct diet, healthy surroundings, and mode of life was greatly favoured. This may be seen from the general tone of the Hippocratic treatises as well as from specific recommendations therein. Such also was the aim of the Asklepiian priests who presided over the healing in the temples. These were always built in healthy situations, often near mineral springs or other natural healing agencies, and the patients were encouraged to live a healthy, outdoor life.

If therefore any of those whom the New Testament describes as paralytic had been left to rely upon the normal sources of assistance, there are probably three ways in which they could have been treated. If they had by any chance received trained medical aid, their treatment would have been on the lines of that described by Celsus.¹ This competent medical writer, probably of the first century A.D., begins by informing us that: 'Those who are gravely paralysed in all their limbs are as a rule quickly carried off, but if not so carried off, some

¹ *De Medicina*, III. 27.

may live a long while, yet rarely however regain health. Mostly they drag out a miserable existence, their memory lost also. The disease, when partial only, is never acute, often prolonged, generally remediable. If all the limbs are gravely paralysed withdrawal of blood either kills or cures. Any other kind of treatment scarcely ever restores health, it often merely postpones death, and meanwhile makes life a burden.²

The points to notice here are, first, that while there is no reliable remedy available for severe and complete paralysis, less severe cases can be treated with some hope of success. For the completely paralysed the trained physician offers little except a miserable existence or an early death. It should be remembered here also that for the pagan of that era this implies not only a weary and meaningless life, but a death without hope. If, however, our patient falls into the hands of those who prescribe 'any other kind of treatment' he will not, our learned writer assures us, be cured, but his life will be made a burden by the treatment itself. This we can readily believe, and we may also note that here at any rate, Jesus Christ's methods were certain to be an improvement on those to which the writer refers. For both in the physical and the moral sphere Christ seems to have been particularly averse to making life a burden.

If, however, our patient is only partially paralysed, the Roman authority suggests, beside the usual expedients such as blood-letting, that the patient should be encouraged to take exercise 'in such a way that he should begin to walk at once, if he can'. He goes on to say that 'if possible, his defective limb should be moved by himself, failing that, by someone else, and by a form of compulsion, it should be restored to its customary state.'³ He goes on to suggest various methods of stimulating the limb, and the precise mixture with which the patient should be anointed. Baths of all kinds are recommended, and moderate food. It will be noted that the methods quoted above from this contemporary medical authority tally with those employed on his own initiative or in accordance with local custom by Christ to a remarkable degree. The resemblance would not, however, arouse our interest so considerably if we had not been accustomed to regard Christ's methods as more of spiritual than practical validity and their results as 'miracles' of a type which appeals so readily to the imagination.

But let us suppose that our patient had not encountered a professional physician either of the schools recognized by our writer or of a less reputable type. In this case he would have to rely either upon the services of a 'wise man' or 'wise woman', whose success with anything more complicated than a snake-bite is not consistently averred even by tradition, or upon practices specifically associated with religion. In the domain of healing these were connected in the Eastern Mediterranean with Asklepios and a number of local deities who later became in most cases identified with him. The methods varied much less than the names. They were: incubation in temples; consultation of the deity either through incubation or as an oracle, and in both cases usually with the assistance of priests or other attendants; intensive suggestion produced by religious rites, elaborate buildings, and testimonials and thank-offerings for previous cures prominently displayed. Add to this the healthy life of those who stayed in the temple precincts, the personality of the

² Loeb.³ *ibid.*

ministrants, and the mysterious sanctity which often surrounded the whole process, and there we have the prescription of pagan religion for our sufferer. It may be readily supposed both from the nature of the treatment and from the testimony of the patients in such shrines as that of Epidauros, that these methods when efficiently and completely applied could be successful in some cases. But their success depended upon the patient's faith in what was becoming an outworn tradition; it depended also in many cases upon a faith built up by deceit and maintained by many cumbrous stratagems. What had it to offer those who could not believe in gods masquerading as snakes, or for whom the mysterious voices had no longer any mystery? This same faith must exist not only in the patient but also in the healer. It was a scheme upheld by primitive mythology and wrapped in the magic beloved of crude mentalities; when these failed, the practical measures would, sooner or later, lose their efficacy.

With regard to this particular complaint, therefore, we see that the patient had not to choose between accepting the help of Christ and his followers and undergoing treatment of an entirely different kind at the hands of the more conventional practitioners and of the trained physicians. Had these other sources of treatment been generally available to the peasants in Palestine, the methods used would probably have resembled those of the Christian healers to a considerable degree. Any sense of hopelessness or despair, however, with regard to any condition of either life or death, would be absent, and in its place a new and stimulating attitude to all emergencies. This attitude would, moreover, be based upon no flimsy mythologies or dramatic inventions, and its power of suggestion would therefore be increased rather than diminished.

So much for the case of paralysis. But what of epilepsy? Here we may note first of all that Celsus states that the patient who has been in a fit will after an interval 'return to himself, and actually gets up by himself'. No very original remedies are prescribed, in fact only purges and the pouring of oil and vinegar over the head. Some of the treatment mentioned, such as the shaving of the head, and the drinking of the hot blood from the cut throat of a gladiator—though the latter is not strongly advocated by the writer—hark back to tradition and magic, but the rest of the recommendations are simple and commonplace. The psychological factor in the cases is recognized by the suggestion that anything terrifying and all fatigue and anxiety should be avoided. But no further attention is paid to this feature of the case. Celsus concludes: 'If the disease has not been brought to an end by the foregoing measures, it is probable that it will be life-long. To mitigate it to some extent all you can do is to use exercise, plenty of rubbing, and the food which has been mentioned above, particularly avoiding what we have declared to be harmful.'⁴

We pass now to the consideration of leprosy. This disease, as Celsus points out, was in his time almost unknown in Italy, but that does not prevent him from including it, since it was common in other regions. The description of symptoms is impressive, but the remedies somewhat scanty. Dieting and exercise are again mentioned, as are purging and sweating, and recommendations about baths, food, and wine are included. Finally, 'plantain crushed and smeared on seems to protect the body best'. This concludes the information given with regard to the treatment of this terrible disease. There is in the whole

⁴ Loeb translation.

paragraph no suggestion of a cure. Much more depressing in this connexion are the words of Aretaeus, also writing in the first century A.D., who says with reference to lepers: 'Such being their condition, who can avoid flying from them? Who will not turn away from them, were it even his father, or son or own brother? There is also the fear that the disease may be communicated.'⁵ It may be inferred from this and most other references to leprosy in ancient literature that, if lepers were not treated by Christ and his followers, they had little chance of even being looked at by others.

In the matter of fevers, the types of disease so designated were very varied, and the treatment almost equally so. They were exceedingly common in ancient times, as indeed in the Near East they tend to be at the present day. Thus any young peasant in Palestine would have known the kinds of fever prevalent there, and would probably have had some experience in the treatment of it when it occurred in the home or the village community. With the exceptional insight and the wide experience which Jesus seems to have had, it would have been surprising if he could not have dealt satisfactorily with a common illness of this kind. Ancient authorities seem to regard anything from three days to forty as the probable duration of what is termed 'fever', and in this case its sudden alleviation might occur at any time. Few recommendations are made either by Hippocrates or Celsus which could not have been carried out by any practical, thoughtful man. We do not know what Jesus did when he was 'rebuking' a fever, because it would seem that no one except the patient was present, and in any case it is likely that His exceptional *δύναμις* would provide stimulus sufficient to make some homely expedient effective.

When we turn to consider blindness, however, we can ascertain precisely what remedies the old world could offer and to some extent compare them with the methods of Jesus. Celsus gives detailed description of treatment for various types of ophthalmia. If our patient had been treated by a scientific Greek or Roman practitioner, he would doubtless have had his eyes anointed with some kind of salve. Such a medicament, if he wished, he could also have purchased for himself in most of the large cities of the Graeco-Roman world. He would almost certainly have been told to bathe the eyes, and for certain affections the physician would have required him to take to his bed and adopt a careful diet and in general the life of an invalid, for a time at least. All these prescriptions, together with recipes for salves, can be found in Celsus, *De Medicina* VI.6ff. The writer indicates that many other types of eye salve are in use beside those which he describes, and he does not condemn them. It is probable, however, that our patient would not be able to afford the services of a trained physician, and moreover any treatment which turned him into a bed-ridden invalid would probably also have transformed him into a beggar. Jesus Christ shows clearly a practical attitude toward life as it is, and rightly should be, for those who do the world's work. Whether that work is evangelism or carpentry, it will best be furthered if all who can are enabled to 'rise up and walk'.

The blind, therefore, who came to Jesus for healing, may well have received in some cases the same treatment from him as from any other local, untrained healer. Pliny, *Historia Naturalis* (XXVIII.47), quotes remedies for eye troubles which are mainly salves made from the gall of animals. He also discusses the

⁵ Quoted by A. Weymouth in *Through the Leper-Squint*.

use of the gall of various creatures in XXVIII.40, and says that that of the smaller animals is considered the most efficacious for eye-salves. It will be recalled that this is precisely the treatment prescribed by the angel in the Book of Tobit, the gall there being taken from a large fish. We can, however, approach more nearly the actual remedy which Jesus is recorded in one instance to have used. 'We may well believe', says Pliny (XXVIII.7),⁶ 'that ophthalmia may be cured by anointing, as it were, the eyes every morning with fasting spittle.'

The benefits of such treatment, and of the subsequent washing prescribed by Jesus, and often a feature of religious healing, might be very real in a dusty region, and in a world where scrupulous cleanliness was the exception rather than the rule. It is also worth while to bear in mind, whenever there is mention of the use of water for healing in Palestine, especially in Galilee, that the proportion of limestone in the upper strata, as well as the other minerals exposed from time to time by volcanic action, might render it particularly beneficial for some purposes.⁷ We do not know the type of disease from which the blind who came to Jesus suffered. In some cases, of course, they may have had afflictions which could only have been cured by Christ's spiritual powers, but it is at least useful to note that he did not necessarily depart from the accepted usage of his time, or from practical, human methods.

Where, however, those human methods were inefficient and manifestly useless, our Lord appears to have relied more upon non-material remedies. ('This kind can come out by nothing, save by prayer.') Whether we may call these psychological cannot perhaps be decided here. But the alternative in the case, for example, of the epileptic child might have been the absurd treatments recorded by Pliny,⁸ which include the lights of a hare, salted, taken in white wine for thirty days, and the heart of a black he-ass to be eaten in the open air with bread, on the first or second day of the moon! Another suggestion is goat's flesh, grilled upon a funeral pyre. It is not so much the absurdity which condemns such remedies, in which no one but the ignorant in remote places probably believed in the time of Pliny. It is rather the dismal, morbid, and sometimes also filthy mode of life and attitude of mind which they reveal.

Hippocrates, though in the treatise on *The Sacred Disease* he carefully disentangles epilepsy from the maze of superstition which surrounded it, offers very little in the nature of a cure. It seems that if the sufferer is young he may well grow out of it. But the writer also notes that owing to 'shame' with regard to the fits, the patient, as he grows older, retires from the sight of his fellows when he anticipates an attack. No such 'shame' would in any case have been associated with an incurable malady by Jesus and his followers.

There were also dumb persons whom Jesus successfully treated. Celsus⁹ would suggest that they 'have the head, face, the parts under the chin, and the neck smartly rubbed; the tongue itself smeared with laser; chew very acrid materials and strive with all (their) force to pronounce words.' Is not this substantially what Christ did for them?

Jesus Christ, however, not only suggested a new and positive attitude to the ills of the body and taught his followers to treat sickness, but he also in a very

⁶ Bohn translation.

⁸ *Hist. Nat.*, XXVIII.63.

⁷ cf. also the use of 'clay' in John 9⁰.

⁹ *De Medicina*, IV.4 (Loeb trans.).

famous parable advocated 'first-aid', using it as an illustration of the ways in which one might help one's neighbour. The Good Samaritan when dressing the wounds of the man who fell among thieves poured upon them oil and wine. Wine was the 'antiseptic' of the old world, although those who used it in this way were not often clear as to its real function in the healing of wounds. Celsus¹⁰ says: 'Upon every wound there is to be applied, first a sponge squeezed out of vinegar; or out of wine if the patient cannot bear the strength of vinegar.' Instances of its use thus from medical and other works of antiquity at many different dates can be multiplied. As for the use of oil, it is advocated either for local application or as an unguent for the whole body in almost every complaint for which ancient medical authorities prescribe. When therefore, in James 5¹⁴ Christians are bidden to anoint the sick with oil, we should hesitate before reducing this to the conventional performance of a religious rite. It seems only too probable that the Christian in that era may have had a strenuous hour or two of sick-nursing to undertake when he did a little parish visiting. In the case of the poor or the lonely, if the Christian did not do this, who would?

Many other examples could be given of the similarity between Jesus Christ's methods of treating the sick and those generally accepted by his contemporaries, sometimes in scientific treatises and sometimes only in homely prescriptions. Any view of Christ's healing miracles which sets them over against practical methods of combating disease would appear to be unacceptable. The difference, in so far as any exists, is between neglect of the sick and ailing, for whatever reason it may occur, and sincere care for them individually; between morbid attitudes to the physical and a healthy appreciation of its importance in a full and useful life; between dirt and clean-living. There is in Christ's gospel the incentive to heal and be healed, not only in cases of severe illnesses to be treated by professionals, but everyday weaknesses. These, apparently, whether they concern the body or the soul, the Christian must be competent and disposed to treat, as and when they occur. He would, moreover, if he followed the examples set forth in the Gospels, have cultivated such a positive and healthy attitude to the whole of life as to be well able to do this.

JOAN M. FRAYN

¹⁰ *De Medicina*, V.268.

THE FUNERAL OF PROGRESS: DO WE MOURN?

VICTORIAN man went forth 'conquering, and to conquer'. Conquering—in science, in technics, in imperialism, his power spread more widely every year. To conquer—he believed that such progress would go on and on. Against opposition, indeed: for he was no weakling hedonist; he did not expect overmuch ease; he knew, few better, that there is 'a warfare to man upon earth': but in that warfare he was quite confident that he would win.

Modern man is not so. He has lived through two world-wars, and fears a third. He has seen the redeemer Science produce poison-gas, and now the atomic bomb. He does not expect the millennium which his grandfather so confidently foresaw. Progress rode in triumph down the Victorian streets; she passes in her funeral hearse down ours.

No; the antithesis ought not really to be stated quite so sharply as that. On the one hand, the acuter minds among the Victorians never accepted progress without considerable reserve. Of the two great prophets of Victorianism, one, Herbert Spencer, wrote jauntily enough about progress when his subject was geology or biology, but performed a quaint *volte-face* when he passed on to sociology: there he foresaw a future of socialism, and that, he maintained most energetically, was a very bad future.¹ The other, T. H. Huxley, filled most of his non-technical writings with warnings that the methods of natural evolution, when working on the human level, were forces potent at least as much for evil as for good.² But the smaller fry let no such fears damp their spirits. Even so good a scientist as Pasteur could write:

If conquests useful to humanity touch your heart; if you stand amazed before the surprising effects of electric telegraphy, the daguerreotype, anaesthesia, and so many other admirable discoveries; if you are jealous of the part your country can claim in the further flowering of these wonders—take an interest, I urge upon you, in those holy dwellings to which the expressive name of laboratories is given. Ask that they be multiplied and adorned. They are the temples of the future, of wealth and well-being. It is there that humanity grows bigger, strengthens and betters itself. It learns there to read in the works of nature, works of progress and universal harmony, whereas its own works are too often those of barbarity, fanaticism, and destruction.³

And Renan, at one stage of his thought:

*Nous croyons à l'oeuvre des temps modernes, à sa sainteté, à son avenir . . . Nous croyons à la raison . . . nous croyons à l'humanité, à ses divines destinées, à son impérissable avenir . . . nous croyons à la dignité de l'homme, à la bonté de sa nature, à la rectitude de son coeur, au droit qu'il a d'arriver au parfait.*⁴

This Victorian feeling is not unfairly summed up in the following passage by a brilliant grandson of the best-balanced of the Victorian philosophers:

Mr. Chelifer loquitur: 'I made my entry in the late fifties—almost a twin to *The Origin of Species*. . . I was brought up in the simple faith of nineteenth-century materialism;

¹ e.g. *Principles of Sociology*, Part 8, Chapters 23–4.

² e.g. *Prolegomena to the Romanes Lecture* (1893), *Evolution and Ethics*.

³ Quoted in Eve Curie, *Madame Curie* (E.T. Book Club ed.), p. 280. Madame Curie herself used to quote it with approval in her later, propagandist, period.

⁴ *L'avenir de la science* (ed. Paris, 1913), p. 65.

a faith untroubled by doubts and as yet unsophisticated by that disquieting scientific modernism which is now turning the staunchest mathematical physicists into mystics. We were all wonderfully optimistic then; believed in progress and the ultimate explicability of everything in terms of physics and chemistry, believed in Mr. Gladstone and our own moral and intellectual superiority over every other age. And no wonder. For we were growing richer and richer every day. The lower classes, whom it was still permissible to call by that delightful name, were still respectful, and the prospect of revolution was still exceedingly remote.⁶

On the other hand, not all the moderns are in despair. The Left Wing, in particular, have received, upon more completely humanistic shoulders, the optimistic mantle of the nineteenth-century prophets. Thus V. I. Vernadsky, the Soviet prize-man who died recently, wrote:

The noosphere is a new geological phenomenon on our planet. In it for the first time man becomes a large-scale geological force. . . . Wider and wider creative possibilities open before him. It may be that the generation of our grandchildren will approach their blossoming. . . . Fairy-tale dreams appear possible in the near future; man is striving to emerge beyond the boundaries of his planet, into cosmic space. And he probably will do so.⁷

But, on the whole, modern man has seen and suffered too much in his past to be as hopeful as that about his future. His view of history is nearer to that which Thomas Hardy put in a dignified figure:

History is rather a stream than a tree. There is nothing organic about its shape, nothing systematic in its development. It flows on like a thunderstorm-rill by a road side; now a straw turns it this way, now a tiny barrier of sand that.⁸

And Sir John Squire's ex-corporal ploughboy put what is essentially the same view in a homelier and more forceful way:

About this 'ere 'istory, sir, it seems that every x—— thirty years or so some energetic y—— springs up and spoils the whole z—— issue.⁹

In this mood, truths long known but kept in the background of men's minds have come to the front once again—the ethical neutrality of the 'fitness' whereby the fittest survive; the ethical neutrality and immense destructive potentialities of science; the background-spectre of the Second Law of Thermodynamics; the secular weaknesses of the human will. The wheel has come full circle: the mind of modern man is perhaps best epitomized in the sentence of an old Greek speaking at the very dawn of our present series of civilizations:

ἐχθίστη δὲ ὁδὸν τῶν ἐν ἀνθρώποισι αὐτῇ, πολλὰ φρονέοντα μηδενὸς κρατεῖν.—Of all man's sorrows this is the bitterest, to have a wide intelligence about things but no control over the course of them.⁹

Progress, then, for modern man, is dead: Do we mourn at the funeral? In other words, Does the death of this belief really matter? Theoretically, of course, it entails a revolution in the philosophy of history; theoretically, too,

⁶ Aldous Huxley, *Those Barren Leaves*, p. 35.

⁷ Quoted in *Weekly Commentary*.

⁸ Quoted in F. E. Hardy, *Early Life of Thomas Hardy*, p. 225.

⁹ Sir J. C. Squire, *Solo and Duet* (Book Club ed.), p. 366.

⁹ Herodotus, IX, 16. (If, however, the words are to be interpreted not as Herodotus's own sentiment, but from their context, then they represent not the fifth-century Greek outlook, but that of the old Persian civilization.)

if it is an event in line with truth, it may even be the occasion for such rejoicing as is proper when an influential error cumbers the ground no more. But these are rarefied considerations. Only a few men have a philosophy which they cherish for its own sake as such: fewer men still set so high a value upon truth as to have their happiness promoted more by truth than by cheerfulness. What of the general temper and activity of mankind? Does the death of the progress-belief involve us in disastrous consequences there?

At first sight, it would be expected that it should do so, that it should lead to a paralysis of effective social action—that is, of a sensible sort; for the action of despair may very well be in the other sense 'desperate' action, urgent and violent action, like the throes of a dying creature, far more convulsive than the motions of normal life; and recent events confirm that defeatist-minded societies do plunge into such extremes of neurotic activism. But let us ignore such pathological manifestations: then, on the positive side, it might well seem that all energetic action needs a sense of imminent achievement to make it possible; or at the least we recognize what T. H. Green meant when he spoke of the 'practical struggle after the Better, of which the idea of there being a Best has been the spring',¹⁰ and went on to say (referring to the objects of our action): 'In our contemplation of these as truly good, the forecast of an indefinable Better is always present.'¹¹ On the negative side, we respond similarly to old George Hakewill's grand Biblical sentence: 'The opinion of the world's universal decay quails the hopes and blunts the edge of man's endeavours.'¹² At the least we agree with Dr. Toynbee's analysis of our situation:

Homo Occidentalis has been overtaken by a mistrust of his *élan* and an uncertainty about his own future which (to judge by the precedents) are ominous symptoms.¹³ Yes; that mistrust of danger may itself be our chief danger. It is hard to see how a society can be saved if it has no faith in its own salvation.

Yet the pessimist may counter by declaring that optimism is not the only spring of effective action: the sheer natural life-urge, or a sheer sense of duty, will lead to the doing of all that needs to be done. Hakewill has another fine sentence:

Let not then the vain shadows of the world's fatal decay keep us either from looking backward to the inspiration of our noble predecessors or forward in providing for posterity, but as our predecessors worthily provided for us, so let our posterity bless us in providing for them, it being still as uncertain to us what generations are still to ensue, as it was to our predecessors in their ages.¹⁴

Even the more pedestrian type of Stoicism may serve the turn:

Though the gods are immortal, and have their patience tried through so many ages, yet they are not angry, because for so long a time they will have to put up with such base and wretched mortals, but even provide liberally for them. And are you, that are just going off the stage, sick of the company? are you tired of evil men already, and yet one of those unhappy mortals yourself?¹⁵

¹⁰ *Prolegomena to Ethics*, p. 180, § 172.

¹² Quoted in J. B. Bury, *The Idea of Progress*, p. 89.

¹⁴ Quoted in Bury, *op. cit.*, pp. 89–90.

¹⁵ Marcus Aurelius, *Meditations*, VII, p. 70 (trans. Collier and Zimmern).

¹¹ *ibid.*, p. 244, § 228.

¹³ *A Study of History*, III, p. 133.

For centuries such Stoicism was the spiritual support of the men of action in a Roman Empire which in the end failed indeed, but in whose very failure is seen one of the greatest constructive efforts of human government. And what if Stoicism rises to the heroic level of the ancient Saxon lay?

*Thought shall be the harder,
Heart the keener,
Mood shall be the more,
As our might lessens.*¹⁶

Well, no; this reply is not really satisfactory. It is very hard to come by safe generalizations from history; but in this one we are fairly safe—Stoicism is not enough. The case against Stoicism has indeed often been overstated. Enthusiastic theists have sometimes urged that Stoicism is a psychological impossibility: Stoicism has refuted this charge by incorrigibly existing in every age as a potent healer of souls. Or they have urged that it is too harsh to be borne: but that kind of argument is a testimonial to the dignity of the opponent and lays one open oneself to a suspicion of wishful thinking. So far so good, for Stoicism: but the inescapable historical fact remains that Stoicism has proved itself to be possible as an effective force only for an *élite*. If it be then replied that in any case the effective force in society resides in an *élite*, and that any attempt to assert the contrary is mere demagogic sentimentality, we may grant it, and re-word our reply: Stoicism is only possible as an effective force for an *élite* too small to give society as a whole that tone of responsible self-confidence which is essential for the maintenance of a civilization.

The verdict of history is inescapable: *It is the cheerful societies which achieve things.*

*The eager hours and unreluctant years
As on a dawn-illuminated mountain stood.*¹⁷

*Bliss was it in that dawn to be alive,
But to be young was very heaven!*¹⁸

Those (however odd their original applications) were the voices of a society with a living civilization: later, the Shropshire Lad's endurance is the cry of decay.

It is true that we must not insist on too precise a connexion between the good cheer and the achievement. The intellectual energy of societies commonly over-runs their highest period of social morale, and, indeed, some types of intellectual achievement require such maturity of thought and technique that they almost inevitably create what is taken to be a 'Golden Age' in what is really a 'Silver Age'; thus, Homer wrote in a civilization in full and manifest decay; Plato and Aristotle belong to the time of the beginning of the Greek political failure; and even the Periclean Age should perhaps be taken not as the Greek springtide but as a slightly faded renewal of the true Greek spring

¹⁶ From *Lay of the Battle of Maldon*, used by Dr. Toynbee as a title-page motto.

¹⁷ Shelley, *Ode to Liberty*, ll. 151-2.

¹⁸ Wordsworth, *Prelude*, XI, ll. 108-9.

that had been tragically cut short in Ionia. Thus the connexion is loose, allowing of, if not actually demanding, a time-lag; but it is real.¹⁹

If, then, we take it that history proves cheerfulness to be essential, it is important to ask, What is this essential cheerfulness based on? If we go again to history, this time the answer is not so clear. It is difficult to get beyond Gilbert Murray's phrase to describe the breakdown of it, 'the failure of nerve'.²⁰ But this is a mere descriptive phrase, brilliant and suggestive phrase though it is. *Why* does nerve fail? And why did it ever come into being? On these problems, there has been an immense amount of research in the last century and a half, yielding an almost equally immense range of answers, from Hegel's 'self-development of the Idea' to Dr. Jones's theory of malaria and Dr. Ellsworth Huntington's theory of climatic changes. But we are still in the stage of investigating the problem, not of answering it.

If history then fails us, psychology might be expected to be capable of yielding an answer to a problem such as this. There is a reasonably definite psychological concept—*morale*—crying aloud for study. One good outcome of the miseries of recent years, and the strange experiments in group-living which they have led to, is the accumulation of a mass of material for the study of morale—experiences of O.C.T.U.s., of the forging of the Eighth Army, of Chindits, of air-raid personnel problems, of war-factory strikes, of war-weariness, of the Hitler Youth, of the Leader-principle, of the peculiar Nazi confidence and collapse, as well as previous materials provided by sundry community-living experiments, rising nationalisms, and the like. The understanding of this matter is of the most vital social importance, in peace as much as in war; and one would have thought that the only barriers to the systematic study of this mass of material would have been the sheer bulk of it, and the perennial difficulties of arranging co-operation between expert scholars. But there seems to be indifference as well; very little has been done on it. The latest English book on the subject, Dr. J. T. MacCurdy's *The Structure of Morale*, is still occupied with posing the good old-fashioned questions as to why soldiers should do drill and giving the good old Sandhurst pre-Boer-War answers.²¹ Our modern resources of propaganda will lead us inevitably into totalitarianism, if we do not give really serious thought to the problems of the manufacture of public opinion—thought much more serious than is reflected in the current exhortations to junior officers to see that their men always get a cup of hot tea after a route march.

Perhaps, in the present state of the study of morale, psychology can say only one thing about progress: Either acceptance or denial of it may be fatal. For denial of it may lead to hopelessness, and acceptance of it to that smugness and lack of stimulus which we have recently learnt to condemn as

¹⁹ It is much to be wished that a large-scale analysis of history were undertaken, by a first-rate authority, to trace out the spiritual histories of the rise and fall of civilizations, and the relations of their various stages of morale and various types of achievement. Dr. Spengler has done it, but in a very doctrinaire way and on the basis of some very queer metaphysics. Dr. Toynbee has done something like it, with pre-eminent learning and wisdom, but asking rather different questions from those we are concerned with here. Various lesser lights have attempted it, but not well.

²⁰ *Five Stages of Greek Religion*, iv.

²¹ Perhaps the most helpful contribution so far to this study is one dating from the first World War: see the late Professor J. L. Stocks's little article 'Cheer' in *Mind*, January 1919 (reprinted as Essay 13 in *The Limits of Purpose*).

'complacency'. Either way, therefore, a man who on other grounds is determined not to act can justify his laziness in his own eyes.

It is our modern habit, when all other ways of tackling a subject have failed, to turn round pathetically and ask what religion has to say about it. Well then, how does religion regard the death of progress?

Of course, the man who faces the challenge of religion not in full earnest is in the same comfortable but unhelpful position as we have seen is the common reaction to the challenge of society's call for morale—denial of it leads to the apathy of cynicism, acceptance of it to the apathy of 'God's in his heaven—All's right with the world!'; '*Dieu pardonnera; c'est son métier.*' The slothful man can have it either way, and can take his ease, whether in Zion or Brighton. But what of the man who takes his religion in right earnest—'I did speak what I did feel, what I smartingly did feel'?

It all depends on *what* religion the man has. There are religions and religions—and which you have makes a difference to the way in which you face the world. Modern Christian theologians are absolutely right in insisting, as against both nineteenth-century liberalism and syncretisms such as neo-Hinduism, on the central importance of dogma. And, for purposes of the present problem, the primary dogma is that which answers the question: Is religion centred in God or in man?

If it is man-centred—and many modern trends of thought make it so—then surely belief in progress is essential for effective action. It is true indeed that, historically, it was under the wing of humanitarianism that progress grew to its once dominating importance; but this was an anomaly; it was caused by historical accidents which have now passed away. For us today humanitarianism, shorn of the faith in progress, is confined to impotent gestures, to ambulance-work within range of the impending explosion. There is no escape from this, except (once more) into the blind-alley of Stoicism:

*O, if this pride of engines too must fail,
If to grope on in blindness is our lot,
Only the fool will dread to choose despair—
A man can find his end, though history not.²²*

Well, can he? Are we not nearly all fools, judged by this austere standard? Our duties may be unaltered by our prospects, and perhaps we may largely live up to that creed or perhaps we may not; but certainly our happiness and our zest must dwindle

*in these times of fear,
This melancholy waste of hopes o'erthrown.²³*

It is an exceptional football team that still plays its best when ten goals down five minutes before time: it is an exceptional man or society that can effectively believe in man as the purpose while convinced that he has no tolerable future. As a society, we have no such exceptional moral gifts. But we are, the great

²² John Lehmann, in *Weekly Commentary*, No. 46, 18th November 1943, p. 13.

²³ Wordsworth, *Prelude*, II, ll. 448–9 (1850 ed.). See the whole paragraph.

bulk of us, anthropocentrists in such religion as we have; and we also know, or in our central thinking assume, that progress is dead. And that is why we are a bitter band of mourners today.

But, if religion is God-centred, the whole case is altered. The death of progress is to the Christian no more an occasion for mourning than is any other funeral—rarely though it may be realized that a Christian funeral is not a mourning occasion at all. For the simple fact is that such deaths do not affect the purposes of God, which are what matter. We do indeed constantly tend to identify our purposes with God's, and in so far as our purposes are purposes of honour and beauty and kindness there is a sense in which they inescapably are God's: but that does not mean that God is compelled to work in our way. If life is Keats's 'vale of soul-making', then it makes little difference whether the road of human history running through it runs up or down. Indeed, if we may guess at all as to what kind of road is better there, perhaps the famous saying applies: 'Narrow is the gate, and straitened the way, that leadeth unto life.' Men can be saved into the glory of God in a declining society as well as in an advancing one—perhaps better; for there is then less temptation to sundry idolatries. There is a great sentence of Alexandre Vinet: 'Nothing in God's eyes is progress in humanity except what restores in humanity the image of God': and we post-Victorians at least know how widely material progress, misapplied, can separate from God.

This type of thought has often been condemned, as in the classical Marxist onslaught, as over-individualistic. But even if we insist—and we should be right in insisting—that there is more to salvation than the salvation of individuals outside of society, that does not say that any particular society of ours needs to be preserved if God's will is to be done: 'the blessed company of all faithful people' is the Redeemed Society gathered from all races and ages and civilizations and barbarisms. Such a doctrine is other-worldly, admittedly; but it does not absolve us from our social loyalties in this particular age and place. Nevertheless, it does save us from the despair that will overtake us if we pin our hopes on such insecure particulars.

It is only such other-worldliness that is secure from assault by those facts which prove the moral failure of pure evolutionism—the facts about that pain which seems to serve no end. In naturalism's 'vale of soul-making', pain is one of the things that make; but not all pain serves that end; what of the pain that breaks? It may be explained as a part of the 'best compossible'; but that still leaves it as a crying injustice to its victims. Pure naturalism and pure Calvinism alike hurl themselves on the rock of our moral sense, when they confine the 'cure of souls' exercised by their different Ultimate Powers to this world of our present experience, in which some souls are racked to the point of moral collapse.

Least of all is the Christian troubled by reflections on the outworkings of the Second Law of Thermodynamics. Perhaps really not so many people are troubled by this as the writers of popular science suppose. What paralyzes action is not *long-term* disillusion—a realization that some millions of years hence the universe will die of cold; but *short-term* disillusion—fear of a breakdown of civilization in our time. No wise man expects, or bases his action upon, any hope of prolonged immortality on earth. Not even our architects,

our chief time-defiers, build for eternity; they only build for a few centuries. And it is good that it should be so; the past must die to make room for the future. And it is natural for us to feel it so; we do not really seek eternal fame, but only a good life for ourselves and our children and grandchildren, a sense of achievement that will last some little way beyond us, a memory that will be fragrant for a while. And it is wise that we should think thus; we ought not to let our aspirations run far ahead of our duties, and our duties can extend only to that limited range within which the effects of our actions are calculable. There is much truth in '*cultivez votre jardin*' as the central maxim in ethics, so long as due stress is laid on good gardening, and on a proper giving away of the fruits. For gardening one does not need assurance of a garden for centuries (pleasant luxuries though the old yew-walks of England may be); one needs only reasonable hope for a few harvests. The Christian, who looks to Paradise—the 'Garden of God'—has even less temptation than others to be dismayed because his little vegetable-plot here will one day be dissipated in universally levelled radiation.

To sum up: The truly religious man, though he has the strongest of motives to his *dharma* (right action), yet stands apart, uncommitted, from his *karma* (his action and its fruits). His trust is rooted in other ground:

*Yet deep within me dwells the certainty
There is no bias in the hand of Fate—
That all creation is my guaranty
Of justice, more than Man's, immaculate.²⁴*

This is indeed a 'faith . . . arming me from fear'.²⁵ It is precisely this non-committedness of religion which is its strength, if it is rightly applied, in dealing with that morale-problem upon whose solution civilization depends. What is needed for eager action is a sense of effective purpose, yet one divorced somehow from anxiety as to results:²⁶ the weakness of nineteenth-century humanitarianism was that it indissolubly bound its sense of purpose up with progress; the strength of Christianity is that it can keep the one when the other has faded. Mr. F. J. Sheed has summed up the whole Christian philosophy of history in an admirable paragraph:

This body of Christ, which is the Church, is growing toward its perfection; every new member incorporated into it is a new cell in its growth. But because it is a living body, it is not meant to grow endlessly but has a stature proper to it. When all who are to be incorporated in Christ have been incorporated in Him, the body will have grown to its full stature and in St. Paul's words, 'unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the age of the fullness of Christ'. In this we have the purpose of the human race. It will continue not until the earth gets too hot or too cold for it, not until some solar catastrophe finishes it off, not until God grows weary of it and decides to end it, but until it has achieved the task which belongs to it as a race, the completion of the building of the Mystical Body of Christ.²⁷

For the Christian, history is a perpetual judgement, a crisis, κρισις. It matters intensely to him that he should act well and earnestly, for he must act

²⁴ H. W. Harding, 'Foreboding', in *Poetry Review*, xxxvi. 2 (1945), p. 70.

²⁵ Emily Brontë, *Last Lines*.

²⁶ Note here the whole teaching of Jesus on anxiety.

²⁷ *Communism and Man*, p. 203.

'as ever in' his 'great Task-Master's eye'. He knows that when he has done all he is but an unprofitable servant. But he is not daunted if success does not come in the way he had hoped and planned for, or even in the way that had seemed to him obviously and exclusively right, for he knows that God can bring His Resurrection-power through the Cross. Now that our fathers' false god has died, such a faith is the only possible basis for steady effort. So we have another application of the paradox that 'whosoever would save his life shall lose it: and whosoever shall lose his life . . . shall find it'—the man who, in one sense, does not care about progress is the only man equipped to achieve it. It may thus be that Christianity, schooled now by two millennia of tribulation, will avail to save our civilization—though (by a narrow margin) a younger Christianity failed in a similar task fifteen centuries ago. It may be that it will not. If it does not, then the Christian will suffer with and in the hurt of his brethren; but his central life will remain untouched. For—'Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the Kingdom'.

J. F. BUTLER

JOHN MILLINGTON SYNGE
(1871-1909)

FORTY-ONE YEARS ago, on 24th March 1909, John Millington Synge died of cancer in a private hospital in Dublin; he was in his thirty-eighth year. Some of his plays aroused bitter protest among many of his Irish fellow-countrymen during his lifetime, but he is now recognized as the one dramatist of genius who was writing for the Irish National Theatre in the early years of this century. Already he has been ranked as one of the few great dramatists to have arisen in these islands since the closing of the theatres in 1642 ended the Jacobean Era. The future will reveal to what extent the claims made for him as one of the world's masters of drama are justified, but even at this early date we can perceive that these claims of his admirers are by no means ill-founded.

Born in 1871, near Dublin, of an old landowning family, he led a Bohemian life on the Continent, after graduating at Trinity College, Dublin, in 1892. W. B. Yeats, who, by a chance meeting, rescued him from his sterile dilettantism in *fin de siècle* Paris in 1898, wrote: 'He had wandered among people whose life is as picturesque as the Middle Ages, playing his fiddle to Italian sailors, and listening to stories in Bavarian woods, but life had cast no light into his writings.' Yeats recognized the latent genius of his new acquaintance and gave him advice which brought that genius to fruition; sending him off to the Aran Islands and the Irish peasantry 'to express a life which has never found expression'. For some years Synge spent most of his time among these people, living their life, storing up experiences, anecdotes, and impressions from which his plays were to germinate.

He listened to the rich English speech of the Irish peasants, which, as Yeats said, 'takes its vocabulary from the time of Malory and of the translators of the Bible, but its idiom and its vivid metaphor from Irish'. Lady Gregory had already demonstrated the effectiveness of this speech as an instrument for imaginative dramatic expression, but Synge advanced her work, perfecting her medium by his unerring poet's selection of word and phrase. One recalls how Marlowe and Shakespeare perfected the blank verse line first used by the earlier Elizabethans. That blank verse line was still, when Synge began his career, the usual vehicle of the English dramatic poet, but not since the seventeenth century had a really effective blank verse play been written, though several of the greatest poets had made the attempt, including such a virile dramatic creator as Browning.

The later years of Victoria's reign had seen the beginnings of a revival of drama in England. The dominating influence was that of Ibsen, and English dramatists were preoccupied with his type of social problem play. In two of his brief prefaces, Synge diagnosed the needs of modern drama and expressed his own theory: 'On the stage one must have reality, and one must have joy; and that is why the intellectual modern drama has failed, and people have grown sick of the false joy of the musical comedy. . . . In a good play every speech should be as fully flavoured as nut or apple, and such speeches cannot be written by anyone who works among people who have shut their lips on poetry.'

And again: 'The drama is made serious—in the French sense of the word—not by the degree in which it is taken up with problems that are serious in themselves, but by the degree to which it gives the nourishment, never very easy to define, on which our imaginations live. . . . The drama, like the symphony, does not teach or prove anything . . . of the things which nourish the imagination, humour is one of the most needful, and it is dangerous to limit or destroy it.' Synge disliked Ibsen's 'dealing with the reality of life in joyless and pallid words', and held him and the German playwrights of his age responsible for diverting the modern drama from its true function into didacticism.

Ibsen had shown that the drama, in the hands of a master, could serve the ends of social righteousness and remain great art as Dickens had done with the novel, but his followers were not masters. The 'social' dramatists modelled themselves on Ibsen in the period when he wrote such plays as *Ghosts* and *An Enemy of Society*. The other leaders of the Irish National Theatre admired the master who had achieved for Norway what they were trying to do for Ireland, but if there is any strong Ibsen influence discernible in Synge's drama, it derives from the symbolism of his 'Last Period', the period of such works as *The Master Builder*, *The Wild Duck* and *Rosmersholm*.

Synge has been called both exotic and nostalgic, and indeed he was aware that the gift of vivid speech had been almost lost in the England of his day, and that perhaps for only a few more years would it linger in the Irish countryside. Nevertheless, in turning his back alike on the blank verse play and the social problem play, he perfected a new form of imaginative serious drama. Though his vision and his style were peculiarly his own and therefore inimitable, one notable younger dramatist, Mr. Sean O'Casey was seen at first to be in the Synge tradition. Since Synge's death, Mr. T. S. Eliot and Mr. 'James Bridie', among others, have in their own ways sought to make the drama serious by giving 'the nourishment on which the imagination feeds'. Mr. John Masefield, whose *Tragedy of Nan* (1908) is another notable play in which the influence of Synge appears to be strongly marked, was one of Synge's few close friends. The dramatist was 'John Synge' to very few men in his lifetime; reserved by nature, he never courted popularity but sought chiefly the achievement of sincere art. It is by his own achievement, rather than by his influence on others, that Synge's—like any artist's—stature depends.

It was not until October 1903 that his first play—the one-act comedy *In the Shadow of the Glen*—was produced in Dublin by the Irish National Theatre of which he had become a director, joining Yeats and Lady Gregory, the pioneers of the movement. Less than six years of life remained to him and the total corpus of his dramatic writings is small—six plays, all of them short, including two of one act, and one of two.

The total muster of prolific major dramatists who have written in English is small in number, and one is tempted to think of Synge as of Marlowe—a genius cut off in the early summer of his development by an untimely death. Speculation on the unwritten, however, is largely futile though alluring, and it is on these six plays—*In the Shadow of the Glen* (1903), *Riders to the Sea* (1904), *The Well of the Saints* (1905), *The Playboy of the Western World* (1907), *The Tinker's Wedding* (an early play not published until 1908), and *Deirdre of the Sorrows* published posthumously in 1910—that the reputation of Synge stands. His

slim volume of poems and translations and the two books of prose sketches, *The Aran Islands* and *In Wicklow and West Kerry*, though possessed of considerable intrinsic merit, derive their chief interest from the light which they throw on the plays.

In the Shadow of the Glen was a significant first play. It is a peasant drama with a very old theme—that of the suspicious elderly husband who feigns death to test his young wife. Synge's treatment of this theme is at once romantic and cynical, and much of the charm of the piece—one of the most cleverly constructed of modern one-act plays—comes from the almost lyrical beauty of the dialogue. The first of the typical Synge tramps—a vagabond with something of the poet in him—is introduced into the play, a tramp capable of the following speech: 'You'll be hearing the herons crying out over the black lakes, and you'll be hearing the grouse and the owls with them, and the larks and the big thrushes when the days are warm. . . .' Patriotic Irishmen hotly resented the implication that even one unfaithful wife could be found among the Irish peasantry; but Synge, ever a nature mystic as well as a dramatist, had perceived the effect which living 'in the shadow of the glen' among the lonely Wicklow Mountains was likely to have on a young and vivacious woman married to an old and morose husband. The titles of his plays are always significant and the mountains in this play are active protagonists in the human drama.

There is truth and also pathos in the erring Nora's parting shot at the end of the play. 'What way would a woman live in a lonesome place the like of this place and she not making a talk with the men passing.' There is laughter and there is beauty in this play, but the tragic and the sordid are also present.

The Tinker's Wedding, though re-written before its publication in 1908, antedates in conception both *Riders to the Sea* and *In the Shadow of the Glen*. It is considered next because its complete contrast with *Riders to the Sea* illustrates the range of Synge's dramatic genius. This two-act comedy is admittedly the slightest of his works—a boisterous farce, showing priest and tinkers haggling and striving to outwit each other over a marriage fee to the ultimate discomfiture of the tinkers. Light-hearted and lacking the depth of his other plays, it nevertheless reveals the mingling of the sordid and the imaginative in human nature, and there is no bitterness in the irony of this comedy.

Synge's prentice-work was now finished, and each of the remaining four plays has the stamp of greatness. *Riders to the Sea*, brief to the point of starkness, attains the dignity of a tragic masterpiece. The central incident is a death by drowning; an old woman loses the last of her six sons to the sea which has claimed them all and their father also. The scene is a fisherman's cottage on one of the Aran Islands. This tiny play is terrible in its simplicity, taking one into the presence of the primeval struggle of man against nature. The authentic note of tragedy is sounded—man is in the toils of destiny. Symbolism and the supernatural have their part as the title reveals. The sea is a malevolent force, a terrible agent of destruction, but Maurya the old mother is equally titanic in her defiance and later in her submission. All the dignity, terror and pathos of human life spent in stern conflict with an implacable environment are voiced in her utterances. 'If it was a hundred horses or a thousand horses you had itself, what is the price of a thousand horses against a son where there is one son only?', and: 'In the big world the old people do be leaving things after them for their

sons and children, but in this place it is the young men do be leaving things behind for them that do be old.' Her final acceptance of disaster, when bitterness yields to benediction, is one of the supremely moving comments on human destiny which the modern drama can show:

'They're all together this time, and the end is come. May the Almighty God have mercy on Bartley's soul, and on Michael's soul, and on the souls of Sheamus and Patch, and Stephen and Shaun; and may He have mercy on my soul Nora, and on the soul of everyone is left living in the world. Michael has a clean burial in the far north, by the grace of the Almighty God. Bartley will have a fine coffin out of the white boards, and a deep grave surely. What more can we ask than that? No man at all can be living for ever, and we must be satisfied.'

The Well of the Saints is a strange comedy, in which some critics have detected cynicism. Like many other great comedies it is tinged with bitterness, and yet assuredly it is full of the 'laughter and astringent joy and hardness' which Yeats detected in all Synge's work. If this were not so, it would have been weakened and sentimentalized; for the theme would have lent itself to such treatment at the hands of a lesser man. The play tells of two blind old tramps, man and wife, who have their sight restored by a wandering saint, only to reject the doubtful blessing later when they have had their romantic illusions, long cherished in blindness, shattered by contact with reality. Martin Dou, the old husband, sums up the real message of the play—the Irishman's abiding preference for the dream instead of the reality (the time of the play is 'one or more centuries ago')—as he dashes from the saint's hand the holy water with which the second miraculous cure was about to be effected. 'For if it's a right some of you have to be working and sweating the like of Timmy the smith, and a right some of you have to be fasting and praying and talking holy talk the like of yourself, I'm thinking it's a good right ourselves have to be sitting blind, hearing a soft wind turning round the little leaves of the spring and feeling the sun, and we not tormenting our souls with the sight of the grey days, and the holy men, and the dirty feet is trampling the world.'

The Playboy of the Western World aroused a storm of protest among many Irishmen who regarded its satire as an insult to Ireland, but the uproar which it created carried Synge's fame into the outside world; and it must be adjudged to be one of his masterpieces. The story of the play is that of a timid youth, who, goaded to desperation, struck his father one blow with a loy and then decamped under the impression that he had killed him. So long as he is believed to be a patricide, he is welcomed by the folk of a lonely Mayo hamlet, into whose humdrum lives he appears to bring an element of desperate adventure. But once his father appears on the scene he is discredited and rejected. The real theme is the 'Playboy's' discovery of himself, his transformation from 'a dribbling idiot' into 'a likely man'. This transformation outlasts his discrediting and rejection by the peasants, and in the end he goes off amicably and manfully with his father.

As in *The Well of the Saints*, the Irishman's preference for the dream before the reality is one of the main ideas underlying the play. The starved imaginations of the peasants feed themselves on Christy's fantasy, and then comes disillusionment—especially for Pegeen Mike, the girl who had fallen in love with him.

There is tragedy in her final cry of desolation. 'Ah, my grief, I've lost him surely. I've lost the only Playboy of the Western World', and the final impression of the play is one of tragic-comedy. Christy Mahon is another of Synge's poet-tramps, and poetry and laughter are closely woven into the texture of the play so that it is impossible to do justice to this, the ripest of Synge's comedies, by giving the outline of its plot. It is a realistic, even though fancifully conceived picture of the Irish peasantry, and belongs really to the world of comedy. But it reveals, too, Synge's awareness of the darkness and depth of beauty and of the mystery of nature.

Deirdre of the Sorrows had not received his final revision when death came to Synge all too soon. It is a majestic work, based on one of the finest of the tragic love-stories of Gaelic legend. Deirdre in fact is a figure who might dispute with Guinivere the claim to the title of the Helen of Celtic story. This play has been rightly called by those who knew him best, Synge's reverie on death; but it was also his reverie on love. It is not a subtle or complicated tragedy like those of the Jacobean, but it has spaciousness and brilliance of colouring in place of the hard condensation of *Riders to the Sea*. Character and imagery are clear, the power of the play comes from the incisive beauty of expression which gives vitality in place of the faded sweetness of so many modern refurbishings of the great stories of past ages. There is no admixture of comic interludes to lessen the tragic tension, as with Shakespeare and his followers. Relief, when it comes, comes only, as in the Greeks, through poetic utterance. The twin themes of love and death are fatally interwoven. From the outset Deirdre and her husband know what the end will be—in her own words: 'There's no safe place, Naisi, on the ridge of the world.' They go back to Ireland, knowing that the king intends death for Naisi and his brothers, because Deirdre fears that Naisi's love for her is not as deep as hers for him; and she wishes death to take them both before disillusionment comes. This is her destiny and, tangled in its toils, she meets death with the fortitude and serenity in the face of disaster which matches that of Maurya in *Riders to the Sea*.

There is a Websterian lightning flash about some of Deirdre's last utterances before the suicide with which she seals her fidelity to the dead Naisi: '... because of me there will be weasels and wild cats crying on a lonely wall where there were queens and armies and red gold'. Synge in this his last play had achieved perfect reconciliation of the twin strains in his genius—dramatist and nature poet. At the end Deirdre has come through storm to peace like Maurya before her—'I have put away sorrow like a shoe that is worn out and muddy'. Synge, so close to death himself, had come to view his theme with both detachment and tenderness; he who had known so much of loneliness in his own life now saw the deathless courage of love and the spiritual beauty of human nature set in the mysterious beauty of the natural world.

Perhaps, in Synge's case, it is not altogether idle to speculate on what his work would have been had he lived longer; though one is well aware of the temerity of such speculation. *Deirdre of the Sorrows* showed him widening his field, and he told Yeats before he died that he was contemplating writing about Dublin slum life. It can therefore at least be affirmed with safety that those critics who speak of him as a local genius, able to work only on the limited canvas of Irish peasant life, are unjust and imperfect in their judgements.

He had fastened so unerringly on the fundamentals of the Irish national types that his art, apparently local, has universality. Some will prefer his tragedies, others his comedies; but his dramatic genius found expression equally in comedy and in tragedy—the two ‘forms’ have usually seemed to flourish together in the great ages of drama.

Undoubtedly Synge will come to be recognized more and more as one of the outstanding dramatists of this century, and as the first dramatist writing in English since the end of the Jacobean Period in whose work dramatic and poetic elements achieved true union—each strengthening and fully expressing the other. He gave afresh to the English stage a sense of majesty and an effective dramatic vision of the beauty, the pathos and the comedy of human life which it had, except on very rare occasions, lacked for more than two hundred years. But the style in which he recalled these glories of a former age was inimitably his own.

ALAN L. BROWN

Ecumenical Survey

COMMUNICATED THROUGH THE REV. PHILIP S. WATSON, M.A.

THE WORD OF GOD IN THE THEOLOGY OF BARTH

(Continued from p. 346, October 1949)

BARTH'S view of Scripture will become clearer if we consider the idea of the 'hiddenness' of the revelation of God in the Word, and compare Barth's conception of it with Luther's. For Barth the hiddenness is due to the *Welthaftigkeit* of the Word. When God speaks, there is never such marked difference between His speaking and ordinary human speaking that the two can be clearly distinguished. The Bible is one religious document among others, the Church one sociological phenomenon among others, and so forth.³² God does not speak directly, but indirectly, through something human, something worldly, that 'witnesses' of Him. It is in this necessary *Welthaftigkeit* of the Word that the hiddenness lies. In support of his thesis Barth quotes certain sayings of Luther to the effect that true theology is a *theologia crucis*, a theology of the Cross.³³ Yet he rejects Luther's division of the Word into Law and Gospel, or at least maintains that it may only be allowed a subordinate place and must never be made central. Greater than the distinction, the duality, between Law and Gospel is their harmony and unity with one another. Law and Gospel are undifferentiated in *das Wort Gottes*, God's one and only Word.³⁴ But within this one Word, as Barth conceives it, there is a duality; for there is something divine and something human. This duality is not on the horizontal plane, in what the Word says, but on the vertical plane, in the way it is said. Here Barth makes a division between *Höhe* and *Tiefe*, 'height' and 'depth', and tells us that the divine aspect of the Word remains *in der Höhe*, while the human element attaches to its downward aspect, 'witnessing', 'pointing', upward. And the hiddenness consists in the fact that such a *Welthaftigkeit* attaches to God's speech to us.

Now it should be quite impossible to do as Barth does, and approve Luther's *theologia crucis* while rejecting his distinction between Law and Gospel. To do so is to wrest the theology of the Cross out of its proper context and force it into an alien mould. The idea of dividing the Word into *Höhe* and *Tiefe* is utterly foreign to Luther, for whom it would mean a denial that Christ is really human. The ordinary, outward text of Scripture is the Crib in which the living Christ lies, the Cross on which the Saviour hangs. Christ does not dwell up above the Crib and the Cross, but up there is nothing but empty space, where no protection and no help is to be found. At the same time, God's work through Christ is of such a kind that it comes to us *sub contraria specie*, disguised as its opposite. When God gives us life, we taste death; when God gives us righteousness, we perceive our sinfulness. Here is the hiddenness that we find in Luther's theology. It lies in the duality of Law and Gospel, in the fact that the life-giving work of the Gospel is inseparably bound up with the death-dealing work of the Law, and that there is no possibility for any man on earth to get behind

³² *Kirchl. Dogm.*, I.1.171ff.; cf. p. 216.

³³ *ibid.*, pp. 173ff.

³⁴ *Evangelium und Gesetz (Theol. Existenz heute*, 32, 1935), p. 4. cf. *Römerbrief*, pp. 161ff.

the Law and the Gospel and find them united in some single and undifferentiated Word of God. If we had such a single and undifferentiated Word, then we should no longer stand *under* the Word, but *over* it; we should no longer be simply dependent on God's address to us, but should have the Scripture merely as the starting point for our own thinking about God; that is to say, we should be in a position to do what Barth always, but Luther never, does—to ascend from the human element in Scripture up toward *die Höhe*.³⁵ The unity of the Law and the Gospel cannot be perceived so long as we are being mortified by the Law and drawing life from the Gospel. We shall see their unity only in 'the light of glory', when Satan is overthrown and conflict gives place to victory. As long as the conflict continues we can do no more with God's Word than listen to it, hear it; and the duality of Law and Gospel is what keeps us in the position of listeners. Acceptance of the fact that these two are two and not one, the obstinate Lutheran refusal to try to make them one, keeps men from fruitless speculation and prevents them from leaving that land of life where the Word is still a living Word and Christ is a man.

Only where the duality of the Law and the Gospel is fully preserved can the humanity of Christ be clearly maintained. To stand under the death-dealing work of the Law and the life-giving work of the Gospel is to live in the Cross and Resurrection of Christ, to be in Christ, the Incarnate. The Law does not add an un-Christocentric element to the Christocentric Gospel, as the Barthians often allege in their criticism of Lutheranism; but the Law and the Gospel in their inseparable duality place the centre of communion with Christ just where the united testimony of the New Testament agrees it should be—in His death and resurrection. In Barth's theology, as we have seen, the centre of the Incarnation is not in the death and resurrection, not in the conflict with and victory over the 'murderer' (as the devil is called in John 8⁴⁴), but in the bare *assumptio carnis*, the meeting between *Gott* and *Mensch* in the Virgin Birth.³⁶ Hence Barth is entirely logical in rejecting Luther's distinction between Law and Gospel, and substituting for it the vertical division between *Gotteswort* and *Menschenwort*. But if the question is raised as to whether Luther or Barth is nearest the New Testament in this matter, the answer cannot be in any doubt.

We have now seen how Barth conceives the Word in its first and second forms, as the revealed Word in Christ and as the written Word in the Bible. It remains for us to notice Barth's view of the Word in its third form, as the preached or proclaimed Word. For this we may suitably turn to Barth's exposition of Luther's treatise *Wider Hans Worst* of 1541.

In this work Luther tells us that the sermon is God's own Word. Those who preach are sinners, but the Word is pure. The priest must of course pray for the forgiveness of his sins, but not of the words he preaches, for these are not his but God's. He must not ask God to forgive God's own Word. He must be fully assured about his preaching and say: *Hec dixit Dominus, Das hat Gott selbs gesagt*, 'Thus saith the Lord'.³⁷ In 1927 Barth commented with strong disapproval on

³⁵ See Hans Iwand's notice of *Kirchl. Dogm.*, I.1, in *Theologische Blätter* (1935), pp. 74ff.

³⁶ This is due to the fact that for Barth the fundamental opposition in existence is that between *Schöpfer* and *Geschöpf*, Creator and creature, i.e., an opposition between two kinds of *Sein*, or 'Being', whereas the conflict between God and sin scarcely appears in his theology. It is only in the light of the struggle between God and Satan that the meaning of the Lutheran distinction between the Law and the Gospel can be understood.

³⁷ *W.A.*, LL.516.15-517.16 (manuscript).

this passage; it was supremely arrogant, an example of the common Lutheran habit of degrading God's majesty, an imprisoning of the divine in the human. 'It goes too far, precisely as (and these things are all of a piece) Luther's doctrine of the humanity of Christ, of the Lord's Supper, of Faith and of the Church, notoriously goes too far at the decisive point.'³⁸ In 1938 Barth reconsidered this verdict and believed he could now approve what Luther says.³⁹ The reason for his change of view was that he had had another look at *Wider Hans Worst* and found a passage modifying the one in question.⁴⁰ Luther says that we men cannot but tremble at the thought that we speak God's Word—we are tempted to let go our certainty of this, because we are unworthy men.⁴¹ In this statement Barth sees an admission on Luther's part that the sermon is *Menschenwort* as well as *Gotteswort*. With this he is well pleased, for he is back at his old distinction between divine and human, which we have seen in his doctrine of the Incarnation and his view of the Bible. Luther's first statement (*Hec dixit Dominus*) thus means that the sermon is *Gotteswort*, while his second (about our trembling and unworthiness) means that it is *Menschenwort*; and so we have both the *Höhe* and the *Tiefe*, just as Barth likes them. 'Luther himself shows in this second passage, that it is necessary not to omit the descent from the height indicated in the first passage into the *depth* that properly goes with it.'⁴²

But the passage in question is not particularly explicit nor easy to interpret. It is complicated, moreover, by the fact that in Luther's manuscript some words have been struck out and others introduced above them. As the original text is legible, however, we can see both the meaning that Luther on second thoughts wanted to alter, and the meaning he wanted to put in its place.⁴³ Barth attaches some importance to the alteration, since the original text says that our trembling proceeds from sin, whilst the altered text says it proceeds from our solemn faith that God's Word is a glorious and majestic thing, in whose presence we are unworthy. The insight into our incapacity comes, then, not from sin, but—'notice how Luther has corrected himself!'—from faith in the majesty of God's Word (by which faith alone the insight into sin is made possible).⁴⁴ It is from faith in the majesty of the Divine Word, Barth holds, that the preacher comes to see that his preaching is a human speaking and, as such, a *Zeugnis* about God, a *Zeichen* that the Majesty is in action. The preacher is 'purely and simply the human preacher'.⁴⁵ Barth's contrast is as usual that between the divine and the merely human, between the divine on the one side and a *Welthafigkeit* attaching to the divine on the other side, between the absolute and the relative.⁴⁶ But it is not difficult to show that such an idea is entirely foreign to the real meaning of the passage from Luther quoted by Barth.

The contrast Luther draws in the passage in question is one between the true *holy* Church on the one side and the *devilish caricature* of the Church on the other. Here as elsewhere Luther thinks in terms of struggle and conflict, not in terms

³⁸ *Christl. Dogm.*, I.415f.

³⁹ *Kirchl. Dogm.*, I.2.835ff.

⁴⁰ *ibid.*, pp. 841f.

⁴¹ *W.A.*, LI.519.6–520.5.

⁴² *Kirchl. Dogm.*, I.2.842. (Italics mine.)

⁴³ *W.A.*, LI.519.10–13; cf. the critical apparatus. Barth takes it for granted that it was Luther himself who made the alteration. The editors of the text in *W.A.* (O. Clemen and O. Brenner) seem to take the same view, and there is nothing to be said against it even from the point of view of the meaning of the altered wording.

⁴⁴ *Kirchl. Dogm.*, I.2.841.

⁴⁵ *ibid.* (Italics original.)

⁴⁶ The contrast of absolute and relative is persistently used as parallel to that of divine and human in Barth's discussion of 'the Word'. See e.g. *Kirchl. Dogm.*, I.2.551ff.

of a difference of value. Luther says of the trembling that seizes the preacher at the thought of the all-holy Word, that it by no means occurs universally where men have to do with God's gifts and instruments. 'Our adversaries, the devils, the papists, the sects and the whole world, are at peace and unperturbed, they are bold in their pure holiness to cry out: "Here is God, we are the servants of God's Church, prophets and apostles," just as all false prophets in all ages have done; consequently Hans Worst also boasts that he is a "Christian Prince"'. But humility and fear in God's Word have always been *the true sign of the true holy Church*. Presumption and pride in human thoughts have been *the true sign of the devil*, and this cannot but be observed in the Pope's foul decretals.⁴⁷ Here the whole contrast is charged with conflict; the struggle between God and the devil dominates the thought. Both God and the devil are at work in the human field, God through the Word, which is His own presence, and the devil by seizing and perverting the hearts of those who are not mastered by God. When we take seriously the fact that sin is a power and not by any means merely a *Schatten*, a shadow, is it impossible to go on thinking in terms of the opposition between the absolute and the relative, the divine and the human; for that which stands opposed to God is no longer something merely human, but something devilish, perverted, evil. Furthermore, it is a fundamental feature of Luther's entire theology, that those who stand nearest to God are those assailed by 'temptation' (*Anfechtung*),⁴⁸ whilst the presumptuously proud and confident are farthest from God. It could not be otherwise in a theology that is centred in the Cross and Resurrection of Christ, and that teaches that life comes under the form of death and that the Gospel and peace can never be separated from the Law and wrath. In the trembling is Christ; in ecclesiastical presumption is the devil.

Anfechtung, in Luther's view, is something that both ought to be with us and ought to be overcome. Trembling and a cheerful faith belong together. They are opposed to one another only as breathing in and breathing out, and both are necessary if a man is to live. They belong together precisely as opposites, and to seek to have one without the other is to invite speedy death. Therefore Luther insistently preaches faith and trust, attacking the *Anfechtung* that threatens to destroy communion with God, both in himself and in others. He says it is our sin that causes our *Anfechtung* and trembling. But then he turns his attention to the kind of 'faith' that knows no uneasiness and has become carnal security, and he sees that such an undisturbed assurance implies an even deeper death than does an unrelieved anxiety. Such freedom from 'temptation' is enjoyed by the Papists and the 'enthusiasts' (*Schwärmer*), and it is a thousand times worse than all *Anfechtungen*. Then Luther returns to what he has previously written about sin as the cause of our trembling, and he does not deny it; but the presumptuous, who know no *Anfechtung*, he says, are shut up in sin without the possibility of escape, for *Anfechtung* is the opening of the door out of sin—indeed, *Anfechtung* is itself faith, faith in the majestic God who dwells in the Word. He therefore strikes out the words about sin as the source of trembling, and inserts the statement that solemn faith and insight into our unworthiness are its source.

⁴⁷ W.A., LI.519.13-520.5.

⁴⁸ *Anfechtung* is for Luther always fundamentally a temptation to disbelieve the Gospel, a test and trial of faith through the assaults of the world, the flesh, and the devil, which cause deep distress of conscience to the man who is aware of his own sinfulness and the majesty of God. (Translator's note.)

The whole procedure is entirely intelligible and simple in the light of the central idea of Luther's theology. Both the original text and that substituted for it are—each in itself and in its context—quite genuine expressions of his thought as it always and everywhere appears in his reforming writings. The introduction of the Papists as representatives of those who do not fear, produced a new context, in which something different had to be said to those who do fear, namely: Your fear is a sign of *faith*. If the old text had remained unaltered in the new context it would have meant: Your fear is a sign of *sin*—you should become Papists! But in the old context, before Luther mentioned the Papists and their freedom from *Anfechtung*, the original text had a very good and simple meaning, namely: Do not fear, but believe!

Now it will no doubt be objected that this Lutheran view is untenable and hopelessly confused, for either a man should believe, or else he should fear and tremble, but he cannot be for ever doing both like Luther. That is said by many critics of Luther today; yet it is exactly the same as saying: Either Christ is crucified, or else He is risen from the dead, but He cannot be both. For the trembling in a man's heart is the crucifixion of the 'old man', and faith is the resurrection of the 'new man'; and this crucifixion and resurrection, like breathing out and breathing in, go on every day to the very end, from baptism till the hour of death. Christ comes to us both as crucified and risen, and comes to us as sinners, with all His majesty in the external Word. Faith and sin are not so incompatible that the sinner is unable to believe. On the contrary, it is those—and only those—who in their own consciences know themselves sinners, that do believe. The fact that Luther, as we have seen, is free from Barthian nervousness lest man should get God at his disposal, the fact that he proclaims the Gospel of God's grace in the man Jesus without a thought that it might imperil God's sovereignty, is no doubt bound up with his conviction that only the sinner can believe. The man who wants to have God at his disposal can do a great deal—he can think out a whole host of rites, devotional exercises and fasts—but one thing he cannot do: he cannot become in his own eyes, in his conscience, a sinner—that lies beyond his range of vision. This means that the man who wants to have God at his disposal wanders about in the upper regions, but never finds God's majesty and never succeeds in becoming master of God. For the majesty of God is in the depths, among the poor and 'tempted', in the Manger and on the Cross, deep down where no 'disposer' can see or reach, where a man can come only if he is cast down by God's addressing him in the Law.⁴⁹ Here is no need of any Barthian *Höhe*, nor of any majesty located above the depths, above the lowliness of Jesus. Human thoughts of that kind only lead us away from the outward Word of Scripture. All that is needed is the audible, external Word clearly addressed to us in its inseparable duality of Law and Gospel.

Barth and the Barthian dialectical theology of the Continent have deliberately put the theologian in the pulpit and given him the task of producing a *theology of the Word*. Barth's strength is never more apparent than when he is hammering home this thesis, as for instance in *Das Wort Gottes und die Theologie*, which very probably is and will remain his most important book, despite the size and

⁴⁹ Professor Regin Prenter has pointed out to me in conversation, how this feature is specially characteristic of the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper in contradistinction from the Reformed doctrine.

learning of many of his other works. The thesis of Swedish systematic theology, that the theologian has a purely *descriptive* task and has simply to give an account of 'faith's way of looking at things', appears very unimpressive by comparison with Barth's view. But, conceiving 'the Word' as he does, Barth in fact raises his theology up above the Word, turning from the business of preaching and the external Word to speculative theorizing. As the Word and faith are correlative terms, the position can also be put thus: faith is a starting point, but the aim is to make a system of the content of faith—so that there is a movement from faith to reason, as is very neatly shown by the title of Barth's book on Anselm, *Fides quaerens intellectum*. A truly Lutheran theology must never seek to go beyond faith; that is, it must always stand under the Word, not over it. It must understand the Bible as a *message*, which Barth fails to do inasmuch as he uses the Bible as a source from which material for a theology can be drawn. Lutheran theology, therefore, from beginning to end ought to be suitable for preaching. A 'theology of the Word' is from one point of view more natural for Luther than for Barth. To the extent that theology really is a theology of the Word, it gives expression to 'faith', elucidates the content of faith—not of *fides quaerens intellectum*, but solely of *fides*, that faith which listens to the *kerygma* and can never rise above the position of a listener. By contrast with Barthian theology, it is clear that there are grounds for the Swedish contention that theology has merely to describe 'faith's view of things'. But we must not forget that, as Luther says, 'faith and the Word belong together'. A theology that is not a theology of the Word, does not in fact reproduce 'faith's point of view', but is constantly in danger of producing a set of ideas that have been abstracted from the word.

We spoke earlier of the influence Barth has had on theology generally in recent decades. The dangers inherent in his view of 'the Word' are often to be found in our own thinking. The chief peril of modern theology might be summarily described as *docetism*—the doctrine that the humanity of Jesus was a phantasm. It is almost inevitable that we should be forced in the direction of this doctrine, if we make it our main theological business to attack Liberal theology; for belief in the human was the deepest feature of Liberalism. Barth's great temptation is the impulse simply to turn the Liberal view upside down, and in his recent work on the theology of the nineteenth century he has not only been tempted, but has fallen.⁶⁰ If we look for tendencies toward docetism in modern theology, we shall find a disturbingly large number of them. The Church is often represented as a sacred object put down in the world by God, without its being made clear that the Church consists of *men*. The Ministry comes from above by means of ordination, but it is very difficult to connect with this the call of the *congregation*, of which the Reformers have so much to say—a curiously 'liberal' trait to find in Luther! Scripture is the sacred, closed shrine, in which God has once for all set down His revelation on earth, and its authority is felt to be seriously impugned, if anyone

⁶⁰ See my essay in *Studia Theologica*, I, 50-3. The same feature is found in Barth's earlier works. Cf. John Cullberg, *Das Problem der Ethik in der dialektischen Theologie*, I (Uppsala univ.'s årsskrift, 1938, 4), pp. 152f.: 'As a result of this opposition, however, a meaning has been put into the idea of theocentricity, which is entirely foreign to Luther's point of view. The theocentricity for which Luther fought against Rome, had as its opposite, not an anthropocentric, but an *egocentric* conception of religion. Luther's attack is not upon man as a creature of time, but on the self-righteous man, who as such is *incuratus in se* and just therefore a sinner.'

points out that the Bible records a long historical process, and that the persons and events in it are human and earthly. Preaching is concerned with objective doctrine, and the preacher would be ashamed to deal with an ordinary human problem in the pulpit, for then he would no longer be 'central' in his preaching. In all this there is one common feature—a reluctance to face the necessity of taking the human into account. The same poison is at work as in the old docetism that was found in the first years of the Early Church.

Once this docetic element in our modern, anti-liberal theology is perceived the question inevitably arises as to what happened when the reaction against Liberal theology began. Did those who reacted really break free from it, or were they not rather still dominated by it, though in a negative way? A reconsideration of the attack on the Liberal theological outlook has surely become due.

If the reconsideration is to be successful, and *man* is to regain his due place in the Christian message, the speculative opposition between God and man must be completely abandoned. We shall never get rid of this false opposition, however, except as we see and accept the real opposition, of which the New Testament, the Early Church, and the Reformation speak with united voice, that is, the conflict between God and Satan. For the fact is that we do not accept this latter otherwise than as a primitive, half-superstitious curiosity; we do not make it the starting-point of our thinking, but we start from the opposition between God and man. Consequently the human is as great and disturbing a problem all along the line in anti-liberal theology, as 'the divinity of Christ' was during the Liberal period. The way to get a right idea of anything is not to stand a wrong idea on its head, for the wrong one is wrong in either case. The right idea is rarely just the reverse of a wrong one, but is simply a different idea. A sound theology, therefore, can only be produced by means of careful, sober, historical research. Prophets of reaction who cry 'On the contrary!' may be very impressive for the time, but they are nearly always false prophets.

GUSTAF WINGREN

GERMAN METHODISM AND ITS RELATIONS WITH OTHER CHURCHES

WHEN WE speak of the relations of Methodism with other Churches, it hardly needs to be said that in a country like Germany we shall primarily be concerned with the relations of the Methodist Church with the *Landeskirchen*, the State Churches of the various German *Länder*. By comparison with the Evangelical State Churches, which ever since the Reformation have claimed the entire non-Roman Catholic population as belonging to them, the Free Churches give the impression of being very small. According to commonly accepted statistics, about 63 per cent of the population used to be reckoned as Evangelical and about 33 per cent as Roman Catholic. These figures show that the State Churches counted as their members all who had not expressly notified their withdrawal from the Church. It need hardly be said, however, that Church attendance and active participation in Church work present a quite different picture. The membership figures of the Free Churches naturally appear very modest by comparison—among them those of the Methodist Church, which today total roughly 65,000. Free Church statistics, however, are not swollen by a large number of merely nominal members, but the majority of Free Churchmen are either actively engaged or at least very keenly interested in the work of the Church.

I. A GLANCE AT THE PAST

The rise of the Free Churches was observed with a good deal of suspicion and anxiety from the side of the State Churches. It was regarded as a menace to established law and order. Even people who were merely nominal members of the State Churches, very often looked upon the Free Church congregations as small groups of peculiar enthusiasts (*Schwärmer*), to whom the term 'sect' must be applied. The word 'sect' has in German a most unpleasant sound; it implies narrow-mindedness, exclusiveness, pharisaism.

When the Methodist Church began its work in Germany more than a hundred years ago, it was regarded as an unwelcome 'sect'. There is nothing very surprising in that. But let it be said at once, to the credit of many fine men and women in the State Churches, that a decisive change has long since taken place in this respect. Especially since the end of the disastrous second World War, State Churches and Free Churches have found their way to each other as never before in German history. In order that this may be rightly understood, the background of present developments must be briefly described.

Methodism came in two ways to Germany. In 1831 a young German named Christoph Gottlieb Müller, who had made a clear decision for Christ among the Wesleyan Methodists in England, began to preach the Word of God in his native South Germany. Although he was only a 'layman', many were converted to God by his preaching. In this way, Wesleyan Methodism came to Germany and many strong Societies were founded, whose members called themselves 'Wesleyans'. The Methodist Church received a considerable accession of strength when, in 1849, a preacher of the Methodist Episcopal

Church came to Germany from the United States and began to preach in Bremen and other towns of North Germany. He was Dr. L. S. Jacobi, an American of German origin, who was sent to Germany by the Board of Missions in New York.

In a number of places the ground was already prepared for Jacobi's work. In the heart of Germany, not far from Weimar, there lived a well-to-do farmer named Friedrich Wunderlich. His younger brother, Erhard, had emigrated to America in order to escape the political confusion of the time and to avoid military service. There he came under the influence of the Methodists and was converted. He decided, although he was only twenty years old, to return to his German homeland and preach the Gospel. In the year 1849 he delivered his first sermon in his brother's farmhouse. That was naturally something unprecedented. The Germans are very much inclined to regimentation, and what does not fit into the established order is *streng verboten* (strictly forbidden). It was naturally 'strictly forbidden' for a layman to conduct a Divine Service, even outside the walls of a Church. No one was more outraged than Erhard's own brother, who was certainly no Churchman, though he was doubtless a Christian. He did not wish to be too hard on his young brother all at once, however, and so he tolerated his preaching on Sunday mornings, while he himself took his gun and went out to shoot hares. But one Sunday the rain fell in torrents and he was compelled to stay at home and listen surlily to the sermon from the next room. The Word that was preached found its way to his heart, and it was not long before the Lord opened his heart. The huntsman was captured. He became, like St. Paul, a prisoner of Jesus Christ. He began himself to preach the Good Tidings, and his pulpit was his own table. That, of course, was entirely unprecedented.

The religious situation in Germany at that time was widely characterized by liberalism and formalism. The State Churches stood firmly and securely established. They lacked nothing. The territorial Sovereign was the supreme protector of the Church of his territory. Even though the old principle, *cuius regio eius religio*, no longer prevailed, yet it was a serious fault not to belong to the State Church. Peace and security can be a great peril for a Church, and perhaps precisely for the Church. When their consequence is either the preaching of a starved, consumptive rationalism, or the imperious, dictatorial preaching of a massive but lifeless orthodoxy, the Churches are emptied and there remain only the lists of honest Church-tax payers to represent a statistically impressive, yet actually imaginary Church. The gravity of the situation was, of course, widely felt within the Church itself. It would be wrong to overlook the many honourable men inside the State Churches, who preached the Gospel with deep earnestness.

It was at such a time that our Methodist forefathers came proclaiming the message of salvation in Christ. They turned to those who had become estranged from the Church, and found an astonishingly joyful response. The Word of the Cross as *kerygma* and as testimony has always proved to be the power of God, even if it has always provoked opposition as a 'stumbling-block and foolishness'. It was inevitable that this new kind of preaching should be felt as a provocation by Church people whose ecclesiastical slumbers it disturbed, and by preachers whose complacent security it seemed to challenge. It was not difficult at that

time in Germany for the police to forbid anything, and so the fathers of German Methodism were forbidden to preach. But they went on preaching nevertheless, often with results that are laughable as we read the accounts they have left us of them. The stories that have come down from those times bear witness not only to the courageous faith of the pioneer preachers, but also to their sense of humour. A Methodist preacher was forbidden to preach; but he preached. The penalty was a fine of ten thalers. As he refused to pay it, his best cow was taken to be sold by auction. But the Methodists were not at a loss. They took a collection, bought the cow, and led it in triumph back to its stall. Preachers were put into prison. They had to expiate the offence against supposed rights of the State Churches, that they had committed by preaching. They went unperturbed behind bolts and bars, and sang their hymns of praise. But this unjust treatment of the Methodists won sympathy for them even in the ranks of the clergy of the State Churches. One of these, named Bauernfeind, in a small Thuringian town, said to Erhard Wunderlich: 'My brother, I thank God that He is raising up such men as you. We have great need of you in Germany. Our Churches have been preached empty by rationalism. The people have been cheated out of their faith by it, and they have lost confidence in the pulpit. We need men of the people to go after the people, to preach the Gospel in the streets, in dance-halls, and everywhere—men the people will listen to and men they trust. Preach in God's Name wherever you go, even though you are brought before Councils and Princes for it.'

Although there was a good deal of improvement in this respect during the following decades, the Methodists—like the other Free Churches in Germany—still had to battle continually against strong prejudices. It was made a particular matter of reproach to them that Methodism was a 'foreign growth', imported from England, the home of John Wesley. In a time of nationalistic thinking this reproach was for many people a reason for regarding the Methodists with distrust, or for keeping at a distance from them. As recently as 1913, membership of the State Church was essential for anyone who sought employment under the Government. The writer of this article wished at that time to enter the University in order to train for one of the higher branches of the teaching profession. His father, who was a Methodist Preacher, took the precaution to inquire in official quarters whether his son could count on getting a post under the State. The answer was very evasive. No promise was given. Non-membership of the State Church was the great disability.

It was not until the time of the Weimar Republic after the first World War, that the Free Churches found themselves the objects, no longer simply of toleration, but of recognition. The Methodist Church acquired the rights of a public corporation in individual *Länder* of the German Reich, and eventually in the Reich as a whole. This did not mean, of course, that prejudices were forthwith entirely put aside. The great majority of the people, including Church people, react only slowly to such changes, or even remain unaware of them. But during that time, bridges were built between the Churches, which created a new situation. In this connexion, the name of Bishop John L. Nuelsen deserves special mention.

Bishop Nuelsen came from America in 1912, when he was appointed to have the oversight of the Methodist Churches of the Central European countries.

As he was stationed in Switzerland, he was naturally unable to visit Germany during the first World War. But immediately after the end of the war he started a great relief work for the starving children of Central Europe. His name soon became widely known. Leading men of the State Churches esteemed him highly as a theologian and as a Christian. The Theological Faculty of Berlin University conferred on him an honorary Doctorate of Theology, a distinction for which he had been proposed by none other than Adolf Deissmann. Bishop John L. Nuelsen displayed a spirit that was the very opposite of narrow-mindedness, exclusiveness, and pharisaism, and as a result of his work the odium of sectarianism was very largely removed from the Methodist Church. The brotherly relationships he initiated did not grow less brotherly in the years that followed. They stood firm even during the Hitler régime, under which both the State Churches and the Free Churches, each in their own way, had to endure pressure from without. That the State Churches were in a special way exposed to this pressure is beyond all doubt, and the intrepid faith of the Confessional Church deserves our highest admiration. It makes a glorious chapter in the history of the Church Universal.

II. THE NEW SITUATION

In the few years that have passed since the end of the war, a quite new situation has developed as between the State Churches and the Free Churches. It is assuredly not too much to say that in this we see a special gift of God's grace. A hitherto unparalleled measure of rapprochement and co-operation has taken place, for which the following reasons may be given:

1. In many towns, Churches had been destroyed and congregations made homeless by the ravages of war. The congregations whose Churches had been spared took pity on their brethren and willingly offered to share the use of their buildings with them. In Hamburg, for example, a large State Church congregation found refuge in the Methodist Church; and the common use of the building led to brotherly fellowship and to the exchange of pulpits. In Frankfurt am Main a bombed-out Methodist congregation found a warm welcome in the undestroyed remnant of a State Church building. In Chemnitz, in the Russian occupied Zone, the severely damaged but still usable Methodist Church was a refuge for no fewer than eight different denominations, which held their services there on Sundays one after another.

2. In the prisoner-of-war camps in all parts of the world, an ecumenical co-operation developed on a scale beyond all anticipation. The prisoners, theologians, students, and lay-preachers of all denominations, were drawn together by the common need and common responsibility, and served as camp Padres and Evangelists. The common service led in innumerable cases to lasting friendships and a deep sense of unity.

3. The relief work of the Evangelical Churches in Germany, that was made possible to so large an extent by the energetic help of Protestants abroad, brought the different Churches into very close and fruitful contact with one another. The fact that a Church like the world-wide Methodist Church displayed an ecumenical spirit in this matter, and shared in the common relief

work far beyond the borders of its own denomination, did not fail to make a great impression. Such action was anything but sectarian.

4. After the war, representatives of different denominations from many countries paid visits to Germany, in order to seek and to strengthen fellowship with the Christian brethren there. Since they did not visit Churches only of their own denomination, but made contact with others as well, they built bridges between the Churches in Germany. Here should be mentioned also ecumenically minded persons connected with the Military Government, such as the Rev. E. H. Robertson of the Department for Religious Affairs in the British Zone, who was tireless in his endeavours to bring the different Churches into touch with one another.

It made a deep impression in Germany, when Methodist theologians like E. Gordon Rupp and Philip S. Watson showed by their lectures and their writings that they not only had an excellent knowledge of Luther, but also a deep understanding of the theology and work of the German reformer. The service rendered by the Rev. Henry Carter and Mr. Elfen Rees, who took up with the widest publicity the problem of the ten million refugees in the Western Zones, is of inestimable value. It is impossible here to reckon up all the bridge-builders, but they have all made a positive contribution toward the unity of the Churches in Germany. It has also been extraordinarily valuable that Churches abroad, especially in the Anglo-Saxon countries, have opened the way for brethren from Germany to visit their countries and Churches. Such visits have enabled State Church Christians from Germany to see the intensity and extent of Free Church activity in America and England, as they had never seen it before.

III. NEW WAYS OF CO-OPERATION

State Church and Free Church preachers had already for many years co-operated in common enterprises. In many towns, 'Conferences of Faith' were held on the basis of the World Evangelical Alliance; the Churches joined in common youth organizations; for years there had been splendid co-operation in Sunday-school work. But all these undertakings invariably sprang from the initiative of individual persons or groups. The Church authorities as such took no part in them. A change has taken place, however, since March 1948, when the *Arbeitsgemeinschaft Christlicher Kirchen in Deutschland*¹ was founded. The two men whose breadth of vision enabled them to see this possibility as the need of the hour, were *Kirchenpräsident* Martin Niemöller and Bishop J. W. Ernst Sommer, who has been Bishop of the Methodist Church in Germany since 1946. The idea was that leading men of the State Churches and the Free Churches, recognizing each other as brethren, should meet regularly for an exchange of ideas, not in order to found a new organization, but in order to discern more clearly the things that united them all and gave them a common responsibility.

The basic principle of the *Arbeitsgemeinschaft* (to which we shall hereafter refer as *A.C.K.i.D.*) is as follows: 'The *A.C.K.i.D.* is a fellowship of churchly Communion which acknowledge Jesus Christ as Lord and Saviour.' The relation of the members of *A.C.K.i.D.* to it and to one another is defined thus: 'The members retain their complete independence in confession and doctrine,

¹ 'Working Fellowship of Christian Churches in Germany.'

in forms of worship and legal arrangements, and in caring for their own interests. They will, however, pay brotherly regard to legitimate concerns of the other members.' The aim of *A.C.K.i.D.* is to serve for the fulfilment of the following tasks: (a) the promotion of ecumenical relationships and ecumenical work among its members; (b) the promotion of ecumenical discussion with a view to mutual enlightenment and understanding; (c) to give advice and act as mediator in cases of disagreement between individual members; (d) to represent particular concerns of individual members at their request; and (e) to represent common concerns externally and in public.

Of the Churches that have joined *A.C.K.i.D.*, the *State Churches* are represented by the Evangelical Church in Germany (*E.K.i.D.*), which comprises most, though not yet all, of the old *Landeskirchen*, and which has as its President, Martin Niemöller, who is also President of *A.C.K.i.D.* The following *Free Churches* are also members: the League of Evangelical Free Church Congregations (Baptist); the Evangelical Community; the Methodist Church—whose Bishop Sommer is Vice-President; the Old Catholic Church; the Union of German Mennonite Congregations; the Evangelical United Brethren (Moravian); and the League of Free Evangelical Congregations.

The meetings of *A.C.K.i.D.* that have been so far held, have been extraordinarily encouraging. The present writer, who took part in one of them as Bishop Sommer's representative, was himself most deeply impressed by the openness and brotherliness that were manifest in all the conversations. At the same time, problems have been courageously attacked and difficulties have not been evaded, as two examples may be cited to show. The first example consists of principles that were laid down for the mutual recognition of different Churches working in the same locality. These principles shine particularly brightly against the historical background that has been sketched above. The second example is a document containing statements that were carefully and thoroughly discussed with reference to the conflicts of political systems and powers.

PRINCIPLES FOR THE OVERCOMING OF DIFFICULTIES THAT ARISE WHERE DIFFERENT
CHRISTIAN CHURCHES WORK SIDE BY SIDE IN ONE LOCALITY:

1. Different Churches, which acknowledge Jesus Christ as God and Saviour, cannot live and work side by side in one place as if they had nothing to do with one another. They must seek to show a brotherly attitude to one another.
2. The glory of God and the true salvation of men must be the aim of their work and the rule of their conduct.
3. Brotherly love demonstrates itself in truth. Therefore, profound differences of doctrine must not be treated lightly, ignored, or concealed.
4. Every Christian Church has the duty and the right to bear witness to the Lord Jesus Christ according to the measure of the knowledge given to it.
5. Every Church has the right to point out to another Church its genuine errors in the spirit of truth and love; but it must also be prepared to have its own errors pointed out by any other Church.
6. Every Church must have the liberty to evangelize within the area served by another Church, if it believes that to be its duty, provided of course that it not only avoids unfriendly provocations, but also makes it unmistakably clear what Church it is. It must then also be prepared for the Church people of the area in

which it is evangelizing, to give public expression to their serious misgivings, if they believe that to be their duty.

7. When God through the service of another Church brings to personal faith in Christ someone whom we have claimed in Baptism for Christ's Church, and whom we have sought to lead to Christ by our religious instruction, then the fact must be humbly acknowledged.

8. It is, however, seriously culpable and not conducive to the building-up, but to the destruction, of the Church of Jesus Christ, when a Church selfishly seeks to promote its own growth by estranging living members from another Church in order to gain them for itself.

9. We are confident that God through the diversity of the Christian Churches wills to let His Name be hallowed, His Kingdom come, and His Will be done.

A WORD OF THE A.C.K.I.D. ON THE CONFLICT OF THE POLITICAL SYSTEMS AND POWERS

1. The rivalries of power politics that are threatening the peace of the world today owe their bitterness to the fact that they are based upon, and justified by, opposed philosophies of life, between which there is ostensibly no possibility of compromise or mutual understanding. On both sides the claim is made for these philosophies that, unless they are accepted and followed out, there can be no peaceful development for humanity; and at the same time the promise is given of a decisive turn toward the good, if they are given their place and authority. Both demand faith and complete surrender, and thereby reveal themselves as religious doctrines of salvation.

Whereas on the one side full salvation is expected from the Freedom of Man, which thus becomes an idol and demands absolute priority, on the other side men look for salvation from Society, which then becomes no less an idol, to whose interests every individual must unconditionally subordinate himself.

2. The Church knows and preaches that neither of these ways, as they are recommended to us today, leads to salvation; for it knows and preaches that salvation is given in Jesus Christ. Only in Him is there true freedom and true community, a freedom without caprice, and a community without tyranny, because the freedom recognizes the will of God and the community respects the rights of the brother.

Consequently the Church of Jesus Christ bears witness over against the powers that profess to be champions of human freedom, that God limits all striving after human freedom by responsibility for the brother. Consequently also it bears witness over against the other powers, that give precedence to the claims of society, that all human community stands or falls with the freedom of its members.

The Church, therefore, raises its voice in opposition wherever the external agencies of coercion, money, or propaganda are employed to force men, whom God through Jesus Christ has redeemed and purchased for Himself, to adopt a false faith and thereby to be inveigled into fighting against another false faith. Neither a false gospel of freedom, nor a false gospel of society, has the right to make a total claim on us men. That right belongs to God alone, who speaks in Jesus Christ: 'I have redeemed thee, thou art mine.'

3. The question of the right relation between freedom and responsibility, between the rights of the individual and the claims of society, is finally answered only by the Gospel of Jesus Christ and fully realized only in the Kingdom of God.

In this world our endeavour must be to find and follow a real and tolerable middle way between anarchy and tyranny; it is not our business to fight for the idol Freedom against the idol Society, or vice versa, as though the salvation of ourselves and humanity depended on it. For thus speaks the Lord to His people: 'O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself; but in me is thy help.'

A further sign of developing unity is found in connexion with the *Deutsch-Evangelische Kirchentag*,² which was held at the end of July 1949 in Hanover. This unusually impressive assembly, in which some five thousand people took part, was a powerful demonstration of the evangelical *State Churches* in Germany. Its importance for our theme lies in the fact that the wish was expressed there that the *Free Churches* should participate in the annual meetings of the assembly. This is a matter of far-reaching significance and a sign of the times. The Chairmen of the Presidential Committee, Dr. von Thadden, wrote in this connexion: 'It ought especially to be pointed out that the *Deutsch-Evangelische Kirchentag* meeting in Hanover can obviously not be carried on by a laity without denominational loyalties. It urgently needs to be in living contact with the leaders of both *State Church* and *Free Church* denominations, as well as with all the activities of Church lay organizations in Germany and beyond our frontiers.' In a thorough discussion of this matter, which took place in Essen on 10th October 1949, the invitation to the *Free Churches* was repeated in a most brotherly manner. The *Deutsch-Evangelische Kirchentag* is in future to be a platform for all the Evangelical Christians in Germany. It is not simply an affair of the *State Churches*, nor is it by its constitution bound up with them. It is to be a platform from which the Evangelical Christians of both the *State Churches* and the *Free Churches* can preach the Gospel together and seek to shed the light of the Cross on the problems and tasks that confront our people.

When the present position with regard to the relations between the Churches in Germany is viewed against the background of history, we have surely every reason to believe that the Lord of the Church is Himself at work to bring into unity them that are His.

FRIEDRICH WUNDERLICH

² 'German Evangelical Church Diet (or Congress).'

'... NOT ONLY OF ONE TONGUE ...'

OH MAY we be not only of one tongue, but of one mind and of one heart!' wrote John Wesley as his reaction to the efforts of the Moravian emigrants to Georgia to learn English.¹ Surely no one will claim that violence is being done to the spirit of these words, if they, at this time, are applied to the followers of Wesley, who, though a large majority do speak one tongue, are now divided by national lines into several branches of Methodism. There is no value in the idle speculation as to whether or not his followers could have produced a single Methodist organization for the World Parish. The historical fact is that certain factors in the situation, at the time, resulted in an organizational separation of the Men of the Warm Heart from each other.

The followers of One greater than Wesley have shown that even with men of love, it is easier to divide than to unite. This may not always be regrettable. Though currently the vogue is to repent of division in the Christian Household, thoughtful men repent half-heartedly. There have been many crucial moments in the history of the Christian Church when it has been more honourable to disagree than to agree.

¹ *The Journal of John Wesley*, Vol. I, p. 112 (20th October 1735): Standard Edition, The Epworth Press, London (1938).

Yet, the temper of the modern world and of the modern Church is such that today further division would not be regarded as a vigorous testimony, but as un-Christian bickering. However it was in another century, at present men zealous in the faith feel genuinely that the leadership of the Holy Spirit, if followed, will result in the tendency to overcome organizational division. Certainly the outstanding characteristic of this generation in the Church is the movement toward co-operation and unity. The entire world, not alone within the Church, took note of the significance of the recent formation of the World Council of Churches.

Since the end of the second World War, denominational leaders have not only been concerned with the World Council, but with world-wide meetings of their own denominations. Travel has been extensive, frequent, and relatively easy. Thus, a new and wide acquaintance has arisen between leaders of the same denomination in different countries.

Methodism has been stirred with a new feeling and interest in the world-wide nature of the Church through all these factors. Her leaders have been among the most active in the World Council. In 1947 the Methodist Ecumenical Conference in Springfield, Massachusetts, U.S.A., enabled the Methodists to know each other as never before. Exchange of pulpits between Britain and America has been an important influence. The war years had caused the Ecumenical to be off schedule. Now the next conference is being planned on schedule in 1951. This is a fortunate circumstance because it means that rather than wait ten years (an unseemingly long period now with the affairs of men changing so rapidly) the conference will be held twice within the same generation of leaders and personnel. Thus a kind of vital continuity is evident. This has led many men to hope that the nature of the conference will be altered. Instead of having just a friendly occasion, when people who have been previously unaware of each other come together for a period of speech-making and depart, now those to be involved in the next conference are warmly acquainted with their counterparts in other nations. It seems to offer a chance of preliminary conversation and mutual study, which will serve as the finest kind of basis for the 1951 conference.

So it comes about that almost two years before the Oxford Ecumenical convenes, we have an opportunity to discover means for answering the desire of John Wesley that we may be not only of one tongue, but of one mind and of one heart! In the effort to look at this opportunity through the eyes of one Methodist preacher in the United States the following convictions are proposed:

I. The Church is one. Man cannot destroy the unity of God's Church any more than he can destroy the unity of God.

II. Our task is to discover how that unity is to be explicated in relations between denominations.

III. Further, to discover the meaning of this for world Methodism.

I. THE CHURCH IS ONE

Our problem is not to restore broken unity to the Church, but to manifest the unity which is in Him. Such a statement is not a blinking at the divisions within the Christian Church, as though they did not exist. There is, however, too

much of an emphasis on 'brokenness', as though it were the only characteristic of Christianity. 'To a world whose deepest need is community, the Church which claims to be the Body of Christ, professing one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, has presented division and disunity. These are sins for which the Church is responsible to God and to man.'² Such sentiments repeated once or only a few times say what is meant, but when they are repeated as often as they usually are, unintentionally the entire truth is thrown out of focus.

Aside from organization and denomination, God has established His Kingdom upon earth in the coming of Jesus Christ. That Kingdom has neither reverted to Heaven leaving earth as before His coming, nor has it been deposited into the hands of one or more organized Church denominations. Following Christ's death, the existence of the true Church was depicted at Pentecost. Thus the Church is present wherever consecrated men are met by the Holy Spirit. Following that meeting, preaching, evangelism, good works, and organization result. These are evaluated as true only when they are true to the original meeting of the Holy Spirit with consecrated spirits. Thus, there is ever a difference and a likeness between the Church founded by God on earth through Christ and the Holy Spirit, and the organizational exemplifications which follow. The difference consists in this: they are not the same. The likeness consists in this: the more the latter equals the former, the more truthful it is.

Much mischief is often done by words. For example, no one can estimate how severely the problems of Church union have been complicated by the fact that the word 'Church' is used to mean either one or both of these ideas. How often has misunderstanding resulted because a speaker or writer used the word 'Church' meaning the true, spiritual fellowship which has resulted in all ages since Pentecost when devout men have been met by the Holy Spirit, while his hearers or readers thought of his statements in terms of one or more of the existing branches of the organized Church on earth.

If, therefore, we can hold the distinction in our minds, it should be clear that the true, spiritual Church is one. To that Church, and only to that Church completely, do such terms as 'Body of Christ', and 'Kingdom of God' apply. In this Church it is always true that Christ's prayer in John 17 is answered. This Church is a result of the Divine Inauguration of it in the hearts of men while they are yet a part of the earthly scene. Since it is founded by God and only present through the action of the Holy Spirit, its unity cannot be broken. Man cannot destroy the unity of God's Church any more than he can destroy the unity of God.

Does man's attitude toward God and toward other men not matter then, in this Church? It does profoundly matter, but it does not threaten the Church. It simply determines that particular man's relationship to this Church. If anyone or any group violates any of the basic principles of this Church, he separates himself from it. The Church is one and its members must be spiritually at one-ness with each other. If one man hate, hold bitterness, or feel himself exclusively set apart from others, he does not split open the Church of God, but he splits himself away from God's Church which remains one.

² Henry P. Van Dusen, *Man's Disorder and God's Design*, General Introduction.

Man can act and think in such manner as to bring himself under the condemnation of acting against this unity. He does not break the unity, he brings the judgement of infidelity on himself.

Our problem then is not to restore broken unity to the Body of Christ, but to aline ourselves with Him in such way as to manifest the unity which is in Him. Does this mean, therefore, that we are to shrug our shoulders at the historical and theological divisions in the organized Church? Not at all, we are to repent of them not because they exist, but we are to repent when they lead to any attitude or action which is not of the true spirit which abides in the Church of the Spirit.

Perhaps the most useful analogy in this connexion is that of the marriage bond. Members of a family would be guilty of terrible moral confusion if they should repent in agony because they differ from other members of the family. The husband is not failing in his marriage obligation because he is unlike his wife, in that he remains male while she is female. The children need not be ashamed that the relative differences in their ages make them different from each other and from the parents. Indeed, the only way in which this loveliest of all human relationships is possible at all is precisely because each member is different in significant ways from the others. The home is built, however, because a common bond of love brings all this amazing diversity into a fellowship of unity.

Much of the diversity in the organized Church on earth today is the diversity which comes out of the very important fact that men are not carbon copies of each other. This is not something to be repented of, indeed we are guilty of moral confusion of the worst kind when in agony we proclaim to God and the world that we are ashamed, in a blanket sort of way, of all our denominational separations.

When, however, these separations do violence to the bond of love which binds us to the Church and to each other in its Fellowship, then we are indeed in need of forgiveness and reconciliation. Let it be noted, however, that such un-Christlike conduct and attitude results as often over matters within the same denomination as it does between denominations.

In regard to this question of the relationship between the organized denominations and the true, spiritual Church, there are various suggestions: (1) Some will claim that one particular denomination is the Church; (2) Some will claim that all denominations taken together make a sum total which is the Church; (3) The claim is here made that neither of these properly picture the relationship, rather the True Spiritual Church does exist and exists in a unity grounded in the unity of God's Character, and that individuals within earthly organizations must seek to express the life of this Church through a spirit of fellowship with all other men of faith. When this spirit exists within a single denomination and across denominational lines, the True Church is being exemplified.

II. OUR TASK IS TO DISCOVER HOW THAT UNITY IS TO BE EXPLICATED IN RELATIONS BETWEEN DENOMINATIONS

It is a well-known characteristic of Americans that they move easily from one denomination to another. 'Conversion' is a term as frequently used to refer

to a move from Protestant to Roman or Roman to Protestant as it is to refer to the experience on the part of one 'dead in trespasses and sin' of new birth to new life in Christ. Reports of an evangelistic campaign will often be observed as containing a large number of people who have been 'won' from other denominations. It is, of course, true that such a shift is easier within certain groups of Churches than others. It is not necessarily true that these Churches are within the same theological tradition.

American laymen are not theologically minded. They take a kind of pride in being unconcerned about dogmas. No strain is felt in moving from Calvinistic Presbyterianism to Free Will Methodism, unless the pastor raises the issue. Even the average pastor is often guilty of agreeing that 'it doesn't matter what you believe . . . we are all on different roads to the same place'. Indeed, the average layman is ignorant of many of the other denominations even by name. When a layman does feel any strain in terms of the other Churches, it usually arises out of some personal or family tradition. His passion for his own denomination when it does express itself may centre around some quasi-theological point, such as mode of baptism or form of ritual, but it is usually, in reality, a clinging to something loved because it is traditional rather than because it is theologically true.

This characteristic of laymen has a double effect in matters of Church unity. It means that the ground-work is done. The laymen follow eagerly in the unity movement. The response E. Stanley Jones gained in recent meetings across the United States certainly proves that ministerial leaders, in matters of denominational union, do not have to 'sell' the laymen, as so often must be done. The layman is more willing to express himself quickly, almost recklessly, in favour of co-operation and certain measure of union with other denominations.

Yet no union is possible without somebody dealing with the delicate historical and theological matters which caused these separate organizations. Any union which laymen would agree to without any concern for a body of doctrine, would certainly be a house built on the sand. For the organized Church must preach the Gospel of the Risen Lord, and the differences of interpretation of that Gospel must be carefully dealt with. The gregarious enthusiasm that makes the non-theological layman glad to unite with others, will not sustain the newly formed organization long. There must be a flaming Word to be spoken—and it must have content.

There is yet another angle to co-operation and union in the United States. It is again the matter of tradition referred to above. When two groups of people have been organized separately for many generations there are traditional obstacles which are more difficult to deal with than many theological differences. The decades that were necessary before the branches of Methodism could unite, and the difficulties that still prevent similar union within other denominations, such as the Presbyterian, is proof of that. The issue which separated these branches of the same faith has long been dead. The two branches (northern and southern) have identical organizations and doctrines. Questions of personnel, of traditional groupings, and fear of the smaller being overrun by the larger get in the way, even with the laymen, and slow down the movement toward union.

When one looks at the theological questions which must be faced one finds

a situation much the same as anywhere else. While there are many theological differences, there is one that if agreement could be reached on it, this writer feels the others would easily be solved. That major one involves the question of the doctrine of the Church-Ministry-Sacraments.

If some formula could be found to enable the ministry of all denominations to work together on an equal basis, that 'working together in love' would enable them to overcome other differences. In other words, as stated in the first section of this paper, the True Church exists in unity, and when men find the kind of fellowship which makes possible their expressing this unity through living and working together in love, even if in diversity, then the True Church is being explicated.

One wishes he might be clever enough to pull such a formula 'out of the hat', as a magician produces the well-known rabbit. But whether we were aware of it or not, the magician had the rabbit in the hat to begin with, and, to date, speaking of a universally acceptable doctrine of Church-Ministry-Sacraments, we haven't even found the hat. However, we must continue to take our cue from Pentecost. Through living in fellowship we will finally be led by the Holy Spirit to the discovery of practical solutions.

It is the proud fact of present-day Church life in America, that fellowship is widespread and genuine. The Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, the International Council of Religious Education, the United Church Women, the Home Missions Council will soon unite into the National Council of Churches of Christ in America. What each of these co-operative organizations has meant to American Church life as the fountain head of fellowship through the past generation, the new National Council will mean in a greatly enlarged sense. The life of fellowship which these organizations have fostered has been largely responsible for creating the atmosphere in which organized denominations which should unite were able to do so. That movement will continue. This same life of fellowship has also created the atmosphere in which organized denominations which could not merge have increasingly been able to live the life of diversity-in-love. The latter is as much an expression of the unity of the True Church of the Spirit, as is the former.

III. FURTHER, TO DISCOVER THE MEANING OF THIS FOR WORLD METHODISM

Methodism has been at the front in matters of Church co-operation and union. Leaders in the American Federal Council of Churches, in the British Council of Churches, and in the World Council of Churches will testify to the influence and support of Methodism. The union of the branches of Methodism in Britain and the same kind of union in America has certainly set a pattern which is making other union possible. What is the next step? It may be that progress will be more rapid in Britain than in America in the conversations between denominations looking toward actual union. Surely few believe any rapid advance is indicated in the near future in the United States.

Methodism has the opportunity again of leading the field in the expression before the eyes of the world of the unity which is in the True Church of God. Why can't we use these days of the Oxford Ecumenical to work out some organizational expression for World Methodism of the Christian Unity?

The various national branches of Methodism do differ one from the other.

We all seek to be true to the Wesleyan experience of the Christian Gospel, yet the temperament of our people differs. The history of Methodism, fortunately, has always been tightly woven into the history of the many nations. Naturally, that has produced certain characteristic differences between the various sections of World Methodism. Theological differences, however, are not a barrier with us. The national differences would not be a serious threat to any expression of unity which might be worked out.

These statements are made dogmatically because of the faith the writer has in the thesis of the first section that fellowship is the key to understanding. We have had opportunity for fellowship since the war never before possible.

If Oxford would give World Methodism the opportunity to enlarge that contact and fellowship, the result would be a sense of unity within our ranks which would set the work of the World Church forward by a generation.

Why, for example, can we not function as a single unit in the work of evangelism in the World Parish? There has existed for many years a close friendship between the American and British Boards of Missions, but surely effectiveness in world evangelism could result from an organizational union of all national Methodist Boards of Missions. Let Oxford take no less than the world as the field into which United World Methodism moves to evangelize.

Or, again, take the matter, which has been suggested, of a Methodist centre at Oxford as a living memorial to the Wesleys and as a creative expression of the unity of spirit which exists among Methodists. One is aware that some details must be worked out to the satisfaction of all before a practical plan will emerge, but surely that does not mean it is impossible. It simply challenges us to work in this fellowship which is ours to discover the means whereby, in a larger way than ever before, we can set an example to the world of the unity which is in Christ.

One feels almost ashamed to list only two such relatively easy matters. It must be true that World Methodism, if it is the most effective example of the possibilities which lie in unity, can match itself with a programme of world-wide scope of greater stature than is here suggested. Indeed, if one allows himself the slightest kind of vision, the possibilities are limitless. We Methodists, brothers in every true sense, yet separated by the curse of this century—nationalism—should be satisfied with no less than one Methodist Church throughout the world, one organization which avoids the waste of overlapping and feels the thrill of united action.

Perhaps the prayer of Wesley, 'Oh may we be not only of one tongue, but of one mind and of one heart,' is now long since realized. The movement of history, however, has resulted in Methodism speaking with several tongues. Now through the work of the Ecumenical Council and the new life it may take on, if we will it, we may more properly pray, 'Oh may we be not only of one mind and of one heart, but may we speak the Word with one voice!'

When Christian men, whether in the same organization or in various organizations, show through their fellowship one with another the unity which is in God's Church, they will be dramatizing to a world torn apart by strife and hatred, the hope of the nations which is found only in the Prince of Peace. Let Methodism continue to lead in showing Him to the nations!

DOW KIRKPATRICK

Notes and Discussions

J. M. KEYNES AND A MEMOIR

Some Personal Recollections

THE LITTLE posthumous volume *Two Memoirs* has aroused widespread interest, as well it might. The man who played a vital part behind the scenes at the Peace of Versailles and afterwards gave his life in negotiating the American Loan to Britain was more than a famous economist and genius of high finance. In the second Essay, 'My Early Beliefs', he takes one back to a half-forgotten world, the Cambridge of the early years of this century and to those remarkable personalities who were to be the nucleus of the so-called Bloomsbury set.

I remember quite vividly my first meeting with John Maynard Keynes, then a young graduate of King's with an exceptionally brilliant academic record. It was at one of those social evenings in MacTaggart's old rooms over the Great Gate of Trinity, when that queer Hegelian philosopher loved to gather a few aspiring young spirits about him and let himself go. Strange company for a shy young Methodist perhaps, but I happened to be taking philosophy under MacT. (not that the 'unearthly ballet of bloodless categories' ever really appealed to me, but as there was no such thing as an English Tripos then, I decided to be a philosopher!). I can see Keynes now as he drifted in that evening, a tall spare figure with a marked stoop, a charming voice, and gay infectious laugh. Immediately came a mock attack on our host, followed by the usual spate of badinage and clever talk. Looking back now, I realize that, as Keynes says, Cambridge rationalism and cynicism were then at their height.

Bertrand Russell (afterwards Earl Russell) I met only once when, during a brief visit to his old College, he read a paper on 'The Nature of Truth' to our little Moral Sciences Club. It was all very erudite, a mild obscure attack on a certain H. H. Joachim of Oxford. Russell is no doubt one of our very greatest abstract thinkers; he has lately gained the ear of the whole nation, also the crowning distinction of the Order of Merit. (That, by the way, means that Trinity College has now no less than five members who are O.M.'s. No wonder it has been described as the greatest of all institutions devoted to learning.) His list of books is awe-inspiring, but I confess that the one I have just tried to read, *Human Knowledge: Its Scope and Limits*, is too much for me; an extremely subtle and thorough examination of the metaphysical basis of all our knowledge. His final conclusion is noteworthy—and perhaps consoling: 'All human knowledge is uncertain, inexact, and partial.' I remember, too, when Bertrand Russell and A. N. Whitehead brought out their great treatise on *Principia Mathematica*, one glance at it was enough for most of us! However, there was something about Whitehead, a touch of beauty and grace, that seemed to go beyond bare intellectual power. I remember his grave smile and the deep-set kind eyes, as one sometimes met him on the way to his lecture room.

Keynes tells us that the beloved leader of the 'coterie' was G. E. Moore, a philosopher of singular charm and personal influence. Unfortunately I missed him, as he only returned to Trinity to be Lecturer in Moral Science after my

time; but his *Principia Ethica*, which came out in 1903, was one of our textbooks. I only remember it now for its strangely intimate style and for the curious fact that he takes about fifty pages to explain that the concept 'good' is strictly indefinable. Moore's personality and his book, so we are told, had an electrifying effect upon this high-spirited band of intellectuals. He brought to them a new religion. Nothing mattered but 'good states of mind'; one could save one's soul by 'communion with objects of love, beauty, and truth', also a good state of mind had no necessary connexion with doing good. Hence they simply rejected ordinary morals, conventions, and traditional wisdom. 'We were in the strict sense of the term immoralists.' Love, the creation and enjoyment of aesthetic experience, and the pursuit of knowledge—these were the real objects of life. But this was not mere aestheticism; Cambridge logic and rational analysis were to be applied in evaluating these states of mind. 'What *exactly* do you mean?' was constantly on their lips in all their discussions. They did not realize that even in debate subtlety of mind was after all less important than strength of character. They used to regard the Christians as the enemy because they appeared as the representatives of tradition, convention, superstition. Keynes afterwards came to see that in fact the enemy was the Benthamite philosophy, the over-valuation of the economic criterion, a philosophy of which the final '*reductio ad absurdum*' is Marxism. So he confesses that though they completely failed to provide a substitute for 'these economic bogus-faiths', their undisturbed intense individualism did save them from our modern poison.

How strangely blind these very clever men often are to the simple truth that reason and ceaseless self-cultivation are not enough. Gay and confident spirits, richly endowed, may lightly ignore all religion, all reverence, all ideas of original sin, all ordinary conventions; but later on they find that bare rationalism and chop-logic are no match for the deeper experiences of life, especially life in the shadows. For instance, Keynes does frankly admit, in his mature criticism of those early beliefs, that after all, civilization itself is a thin and precarious crust; there are 'the deeper and blinder passions both good and bad'.

Although he felt unable to change his general philosophy of life, he confesses finally: 'There may have been just a grain of truth when Lawrence said in 1914 that we were done for.' It does seem a strange irony to think of D. H. Lawrence of all people setting up as a guide to the true path of life—a case of Satan rebuking sin, some might call it. But really it was nothing less than religious intolerance that prompted his fierce dislike of Keynes and his friends. They made him dream of beetles, he declared. His intuition was that they were brilliant, self-centred, essentially brittle. They had no deep feeling, no reverence.

I did not know Lawrence personally, though I was once in his company for a few minutes—an unforgettable experience. I did live for twelve months in Eastwood, his old home, and knew some of his early friends. I am sure that he had the making of an ascetic; there was a marked Puritan strain, the sort of man who in olden days might easily have been a monk. Tormented genius that he was, Lawrence revolted vehemently against conventional religion; he despised what Wordsworth called 'the quick turns of self-applauding intellect', that lust of the head that mars our modern life. In his desperate search for the final truth, for an altogether new way of living, he went after the dark

gods lurking behind all modern civilization. It was a most tragic failure; and yet he was partly right in his fierce protest, so often do we find 'a soul of goodness in things evil'. He sensed what was wrong with these others; they were too clever by half, they were skimming airily over the surface of life, and therefore they were 'done for for ever'.

But were they really 'done for'? Lawrence, being the man he was, could not be quite fair to them, any more than the conventional people who came to denounce this Bloomsbury set. As my friend Handley Jones writes in a recent letter: 'To a man like him they must have seemed fine-drawn and over-civilized to the vanishing point. . . . By all accounts they looked and talked like French aristocrats of the "*ancien régime*", and anyone would have thought they were equally doomed and damned. . . . But who would have thought they had so much blood in them?' Keynes himself, to say nothing of the others, was manifestly far more than an extremely clever man. He must have been of very tough fibre. He bore the tremendous strain of the American Loan negotiations and in the end he gave his life for the cause. And, he came from a remarkable stock; his father Dr. J. N. Keynes, our Lecturer in Logic, whose death at ninety-seven has just been announced, was a very influential thinker, wholly devoted to Cambridge. Incidentally, if I am not mistaken, his grandfather was the biographer of Bunyan.

This very intimate and moving personal confession is perhaps an illustration of Humanism at its very highest and most attractive. John Maynard Keynes (or Lord Keynes, to give him his proper title) has been described by one writer as the most civilized man in Europe. He and those friends of his were not far from the Kingdom of heaven; and yet—'the little less and what worlds away'! Some gifted men, with sublime if not fool-hardy courage, presume to take upon themselves the mystery of things, as Lear put it; and some calmly ignore the whole Christian position with its own majestic philosophy and traditions. 'Good states of mind.' Yes, indeed, but to the humble believer, *goodness* means *God*; it means Our Lord Jesus Christ in whom were all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.

CHARLES GIMBLETT

THE FUNCTION OF RELIGIOUS DRAMA IN THE MODERN WORLD

MANY SUGGESTIONS are being put forward to explain the emergence of a Christian poetic drama during the last fifteen years. One is that this generation is as urgently in need of having God's truth *shown* to their ignorant minds as was the unlettered audience of the Miracle and Mystery plays of the Middle Ages. Another is that it is the finest form of self-expression and creative activity for people otherwise denied the opportunity to express and to create in an over-industrialized world.

There is truth in both these suggestions, but neither of them goes deep enough. We have been told, with profound truth, that 'God is the hero of Christian drama': do we realize that He is also the author of it? Quite simply, drama is—must be—one of the means by which He is saying to us some of the many things He would: are we able to bear them yet?

This is inspiring, but it is also awe-inspiring. In the same lecture (at the Birmingham School of Religious Drama in 1947) in which the Rev. Noel Davey said 'God is the hero of Christian drama', he also called this drama 'playing with fire from Heaven'. It is a highly dangerous, 'onchancy' element, as John Wesley would soon realize if he were alive today. There is also the frightful danger of playing with fire that is not from Heaven, and of not finding out until the conflagration is raging.

Drama is a trinity of author, actor, and audience, as Miss Dorothy L. Sayers has pointed out, and does not come to *full* life until all three have participated. Therefore all three have an equal responsibility to understand drama and its functions, and to allow themselves to be used by God in this medium.

The first thing that must strike anyone attempting a survey of religious drama since its renaissance (dated, roughly, in 1934 with the production of *The Rock*) is its tremendous *range*. At the one end we have plays of the calibre of Mr. Eliot's *The Rock* and *Murder in the Cathedral* and Charles Williams's *The House of the Octopus*, while at the other we have the little Nativity play our own church put on last Christmas! When we say 'religious drama' do we mean ALL that?

We should not, automatically. There may be much in that field that is not truly 'drama'; much that is not within what we would have 'religious' to mean. It may clarify our thinking if we substitute the word 'Christian' for 'religious'; it will help us to formulate our standards. We need not think that this excludes Old Testament plays, but it does remind us that they, rightly understood, should show the development of the Divine Plan toward Christ. Those who know Philip J. Lamb's great play, *Go Down Moses*, know the heights to which such an Old Testament play can lift actors and audience—because its conflict is fought against the background of the Eternal Purpose.

It is when we use the word 'conflict' that we come nearest to understanding the peculiar function of drama in the modern world. Without conflict there is no drama—but that is not all. There is conflict also in a discussion script, but that cannot give us the God-sent experience of great drama. In a play, the conflict is fought to its climax. No other form of art or entertainment has this

conflict-leading-to-climax as an essential; nothing else can do drama's work in this age.

For this is, above all, an age of conflict. Nation with nation, class with class, ideology with ideology—even denomination with denomination—are all in conflict, and

God's peace nowhere.

Drama does not add yet another to this already overpowering battleground: rather, it exposes some aspect of what already exists. Escapism is useless: we must face at any rate a part of the cosmic conflict, and try to see it steadily.

Drama not only exposes: it resolves. The conflict is fought to a climax. In this atomic age, with traditional values being daily swept aside, mankind is existing on a species of quicksand. Christian drama can show this—but it can also show the Rock which is the other protagonist in the spiritual warfare; it can show the ultimate triumph of God. This is not wishful thinking but proven history and spiritual fact.

The play that is to attempt this must be sound dramatically and theologically. We are concerned with laying paving-stones across earth's rough places, not in Hell, and good intentions are not enough. Many so-called 'plays' have been written by amateurs whose intentions were unimpeachable but whose dramatic technique was not strong enough. There have also been many dramatists who have been betrayed into expressing a dangerously woolly conception of Christian truth. It is significant that the annual School organized by the Religious Drama Society preserves the balance between these two essentials, and the Lectures given by theologians are as important as the classes in dramatic art.

Another source of drama's value is its *fundamental* quality, below the denominational differences. Every student at the R.D.S. Schools not only widens his horizon but deepens his roots. It is not so much that he ignores the denominational barriers, as that he digs down below them and also sees over them. Many of us believe that drama has a vital part to play in the ecumenical movement.

Once we are aware of its deep, God-centred roots, we may safely turn our attention to some of drama's leaves. It is quite true that Christian drama *is* and *does* the things claimed for it in the first paragraph. As a means of calling the non-churchgoer's attention to the Gospel, it has an advantage over films which has not yet been fully realized. Drama is *live*: its impact is made through human agency *at the time* and in fellowship not only with the audience but also with the actors and, often, the author. The action of the Holy Spirit has been experienced often by those participating in a fine play, and certainly we should never attend a Christian play (in any capacity) without deliberately invoking the action of God.

The *action*—not merely the blessing. There should be nothing in our life on which we are not able to invite His blessing, but there are few things in which we can so confidently beseech His direct *action*.

This means that we must think always of our Christian dramatic work as 'playing with Fire from Heaven'. Our task is to prepare the hearth, with its furnishings and fuel, and then—wait for the Fire to fall. Therefore all our preparations must be such that can be used of God. His eternal truth is the test

of play and players alike. Vague theology and histrionic exhibitionism are alike hindrances, and will either deaden and extinguish the Fire or—be scorched. We cannot tell which.

But there is, very close to this, a real danger which is a cause of great distress to many well-intentioned people. It is perfectly true that fire may be called down by plays which are not first-rate in dramatic quality and/or theology. Many people do experience real emotion during the sincere acting of plays which, judged by the highest standards, are not good enough.

Fire falls, but are we certain it is from Heaven?

The worth-while emotion experienced by many of the Hitler Youth in Germany during the five years before the Second World War should be sufficient proof that it is possible to evoke worthy response (for a time) by unworthy means and for unworthy ends. When this is done the tragedy is immense and the harm incalculable. *The fact that a play generates good emotions is not, in itself, a proof of that play's sterling worth.*

Some plays do one worth-while thing so well that they blind us to the fact that they are ignoring or contradicting vital facts of Christian truth. There was an example of this in London last year, when an American play, presenting a charming picture of the domestic life of the Mother of Christ, the rest of the family and various neighbours, was most beautifully acted in a West End theatre—and many were so moved that they failed to realize that this play utterly ignored the fact that He was the Son of God; that He came to earth to reveal God; that He not only died a felon's death but He rose again triumphant and gave to men a Spirit that has changed history.

Churchgoers learn these truths in Church—but what of the 'outsiders' who saw that play? They would get the impression that Christ's mission was no more than to teach 'the greatness and the dignity of man', and that the Resurrection was a vague rumour of a hallucination of a few unbalanced devotees. That is NOT Christian drama—but many thought it was.

Our responsibilities are colossal—but so are our opportunities and our available guidance. We can be used of God in this medium if we place ourselves unreservedly under His discipline.

JESSIE POWELL

A PSYCHOLOGICAL REVOLUTION?

The Reach of the Mind, by J. B. Rhine. (Faber and Faber, 10s. 6d.)

EITHER this book marks the beginning of a new epoch in human thought or it is based on experimental work which, though it has been proceeding for a long while and has been checked and counter-checked by all manner of means, is somehow quite untrustworthy. Dr. Rhine's results are so devastatingly shattering to all our present beliefs that 'There must be a snag somewhere' is the murmur which arises as one reads, yet where and what that snag is, the present reviewer, at least, cannot say.

Dr. Rhine, with others, published the book called *Extra Sensory Perception* in 1940 and a 'Penguin' book called *New Frontiers of the Mind* in 1948. What is commonly called in this country Psychical Research, or in America Parapsychology, is no new thing. Duke University, which has a parapsychological laboratory, publishes a journal of Parapsychology, and societies for psychical research exist both here and in the States. Yet orthodox psychology and science are both as resentful of the new ideas as orthodox theology has so often proved regarding new doctrines. Dr. Rhine gives melancholy examples of the unwillingness of scientists to give not merely credence, but even a hearing, to his claims. Some who have investigated them have even said that they dare not risk their reputation by being associated with such unheard-of notions. 'My family has to eat,' said one, and 'My institution would object,' said another—remarks which do small credit to the boasts of science that it seeks impartially for truth.

What then are these findings which are anathema to these scientists? First, those of experiments in extra-sensory perception—'E.S.P.' for short. A long series of experiments, conducted over many years, has shown that a number of people are able to guess the number on a card with a degree of success above the chance level. The cards may be shuffled by hand or by mechanical means, and the percipient may be near or at a distance, but the chance proportion is significantly exceeded. We may say that the percipient may be clairvoyantly seeing the card or telepathically reading the mind of the experimenter who looks at it, but such phrases do not really explain. The alternative is to admit that there are instances of precognition.

This is unpalatable enough for the materialistically minded, but worse is to come. The results of psycho-kinesis, 'P.K.' for short, are more devastating than precognition. This series of experiments indicates that a proportion of successful results, significantly greater than can be obtained by chance, follows when the *mind*, at least of some men, attempts to influence physical objects *directly*. Those who hold, as many psychologists have done, that mind and body interact, must admit that the mental can influence the physical, but all have assumed that this can obtain only between the thinker's own mind and brain. Why this should be so, is not clear, but nobody, owing to our inveterate habits of thought, has troubled seriously to question it. But if the P.K. experiments are to be trusted, certain people can 'will' that dice, for instance, whether thrown by hand or mechanically, shall fall with a greater frequency of high over low, or low over high, numbers—and they do. The average man will say

'Rubbish'. Yet it remains that some people constantly, though not invariably, succeed in this to an extent significantly above the chance average.

Are we to believe these things? Dr. Rhine is confident. He says 'every conceivable counter-explanation has been considered and found inapplicable'. Yet he frankly states that at present neither of these parapsychical abilities is sufficiently dependable to be counted upon in personal life or professional work. It is admitted that the variation above chance is greater in E.S.P. than in P.K. It is also true that not all practitioners *maintain* their powers, which seem to work 'according to your faith'. One was succeeding in getting significant results in P.K. when he was chaffed and his confidence disturbed. The succeeding results fell below the chance level! In this country the few P.K. experiments which have been attempted have not succeeded as well as those performed at Duke University. Again, one girl who was getting results far above average, 18 out of 25, fell ill, and when she recovered found she had lost the power, getting only a chance average. Both abilities, it would seem, are precarious and fickle.

All this and more can be said, but the fact remains that there is abundant evidence for both these alleged abilities, gained from repeated tests made by different people over hundreds of series. It is this that calls for elucidation. What next then? Dr. Rhine makes rather fantastic speculations as regards possible future developments. It may be that just as long research into telepathic and clairvoyant phenomena has hitherto brought little definite evidence of an undeniable character, E.S.P. and P.K. may continue to bear witness to elusive and capricious potencies. But we cannot leave matters as they stand. Enough has been done to show that these inquiries must continue, and though orthodox science may try to suffocate them by contempt or neglect, they are not likely to be abandoned. Their possibilities are far-reaching. For example, if P.K. exists, however rarely, our attitude toward the miraculous is bound to be revised. Far more than that, if there can be any mental interference with the order of Nature, the results may be more potent than those of atomic energy. Dr. Rhine's laboratory may prove to be a danger centre, and 'the watch on the Rhine' may gain a new meaning!

ERIC S. WATERHOUSE

A SOUTH AFRICAN PIONEER

Life and Times of Daniel Lindley, by Edwin W. Smith. (The Epworth Press, 21s.)

DR. EDWIN W. SMITH has again enriched the Library of South African Literature. This is his fifteenth book on Africa and is not a whit behind the others in clear, well-informed and competent construction. Its recent appearance is particularly *à propos* in view of the special Voortrekkers' celebration in Pretoria. The writer's ability for his task is based on a life's service and devotion to Africa, his deep understanding of the African and his intimate knowledge of their speech, outlook, and *soul*. He had access to documents and letters not hitherto available. He had the courage for the task, which involved much research and travelling in three continents, to assemble material.

The book has three parts. The first describes Daniel Lindley's preparation and call to missionary service; the second sets forth his great but unexpected ministry to the Boer Voortrekkers northward from the Cape; the third deals with his work in Natal and Zululand. Daniel Lindley belonged to an English family that had emigrated to America 'to be free to worship God'. They joined a Presbyterian church of extreme Calvinist convictions and the story of their rigid Puritan lives, as *pioneers*, is of thrilling interest. Lindley, who graduated at the Ohio University in his twenty-third year, had been 'hopefully converted' and resolved to enter the Presbyterian Ministry. He passed through the Andover Theological Seminary and in 1832 was Pastor of the Rocky River Church. But that was not to be the sphere of his service. One day he read in the *Missionary Herald* an appeal 'for men to go to the non-Christian world'. God spoke to him. It was a call not to be denied. He was one of the first 'to offer to pioneer for Christian Zululand'. This was in December 1832. He offered himself to the American Board of Foreign Missions, which, though begun by the New England Congregational Church, was later put on an Interdenominational basis. Lindley was accepted, and in 1834, at 33 years of age, he was the oldest of six men to be sent to Zululand. With their wives—brave, fine women—they set sail for Africa. They reached Cape Town in February 1835. At once Table Mountain dominated their perspective (as it did mine in 1896). The famous Dr. John Philip welcomed them and soon they were on the move. One party—the Lindleys, Wilsons, and Venables—began their ox-wagon trek up Africa to Matabeleland. The other party—the Champions, Grouts, and Adamses—took the coastal trek to Zululand. This was 'twenty-five years before the first railway was built in South Africa'. What an adventure by ox-wagon! They travelled at the mad rate of two miles an hour. It was their first lesson in philosophic patience! They little dreamed that the 'Great Trek' of Dutch farmers from the Cape, 'to find a home in the North', would intercept their journey, and that the Zulu Chaka was again on the war-path. (The author uses the name *Shaka*, as does Morton in his book, *In Search of South Africa*. The revised spelling of the name is 'Tshaka', but many would keep to the historic 'Chaka'.)

All their plans were frustrated. They had to turn back, but Lindley felt called to minister to the Boer Voortrekkers. What a story the author weaves

about his experiences! An Englishman by origin becoming the *Predikant* (minister) to the Dutch in what we know as Natal, the Orange Free State, and the Transvaal! Only those who lived in South Africa before the Boer War can really appraise its meaning—and wonder. For seven and a half years Lindley was the Voortrekkers' minister. Even President Kruger was 'proud of his *Predikant*'. He became a real father-in-God. The Boers said of him: '*Magtig! Net so goed as 'n Afrikaner*'; but he was just as good as a Boer. Again I see him in charge of the Dutch 'Church of the Vow' in Pietermaritzburg. This is but a small window into a great romance of Christian service.

Then we see Daniel Lindley going to the field of his original call—to serve the *Ama-Zulu*. Ere long he is preaching under the now famous tree of Umzin-yati. Anon, he meets the great Chief *Mpanda*. What a scene for the artist's touch! Lindley, Grout, and Adams, each in his own special way, rendered service never to be forgotten. *Groutville*, *Adams's Mission* and *Inanda* will ever retain the spiritual impression made by these intrepid Missionary Voortrekkers.

One smiles to see Lindley and Bishop Colenso, away back in 1853, discussing the differential values of African names for God: 'u Tixo,' of Hottentot origin, 'Nkulunkulu', and 'u Dio', the Zuluized form of *Deus* that the Bishop seemed to prefer.¹ While Lindley did not become a politician, he felt bound to fight for the land rights and contentment of the Zulu people in their ancestral home. Problems of social and family life had to be faced and the possible sublimation of some Native customs, particularly *Uku-Lobola*, which even yet is an anxiety to many missionaries.

The 'Times' of Daniel Lindley, as set forth in the book, were of outstanding concern in the country's history. The racial tensions between Briton, Boer, and Bantu, and between Black and White were tragic. Bitter and fearful battles were fought. It was not until 1910 that hope for a living Union was envisaged. But even yet the outlook is not free from cloud. But, happily, the author steers away from the phases of racial animosity and steadily unveils in a thrilling narrative, the contribution the missionaries of all Churches have made for the good of South Africa. He stresses the debt we owe to such men as Daniel Lindley. '*Bayete! Umfundisi*,' 'Greetings to a great minister of Christ.' No wonder Lindley's *Alma Mater*, the Ohio University of the U.S.A., conferred on him the coveted D.D. degree, and that he had such a welcome home after his unique service to Zululand and South Africa.

The author has placed us in his debt again. His book is rich in all the romance of missionary work in its 'pioneer' service. Even the Afrikaners, when anticipating their nation-wide Voortrekker celebrations, were prepared to give a great welcome to the name of Daniel Lindley. Only one who was born in South Africa and in whom the very *soul* of Africa had found a home, could write this book.

ALLEN LEA

¹ The heathen Zulu name for God—meaning 'the-One-who-was-before-anything-and-made-the-world'—was *Veli Ngauqi*. When the missionaries went to Zululand and told the people of *Nkulunkulu*—the 'Great-Great-One-the-Supreme-Being'—their hearers said: 'O, that must be the son of *Veli Ngauqi*, and it is easy for us to believe in *Nkulunkulu*.' The writer had this story from a fine old Zulu Methodist when out-spanning at the foot of the *Ghost Mountain* in Zululand many years ago.

Recent Literature

Lives of the Prophets: A Thousand Years of Hebrew Prophecy Reviewed in Its Historical Context, by Stephen L. Caiger. (S.P.C.K., 10s. 6d.)

His Servants The Prophets, by Eric William Heaton. (S.C.M., 7s. 6d.)

These two introductions to the prophets are complementary to each other. The former (the second edition, considerably revised, of a work originally published in 1936) is a straightforward account of the rise and development of the prophetic movement with short summaries of the message and work of each prophet; in the latter a minimum of space is devoted to historical and literary explanation, and the bulk of the book consists of a systematic presentation of the prophetic teaching as a whole.

Mr. Caiger has produced a book which the beginner will find both interesting and informative. In simple yet vivid language the whole sweep of Hebrew prophecy, from Samuel to Deutero-Zechariah, is surveyed, not as an isolated phenomenon, but as an integral part of the national history. The author's imaginative insight and archaeological knowledge add colour and detail to his presentation of the facts. But sometimes his imagination goes too far. For instance, one of the most telling points in a superb story is spoiled when he relates (p. 65) that 'Elisha came forward, and offered Naaman the unexpectedly simple prescription. . . .' The book is not free from other inaccuracies; and some of the generalizations and modernizations are misleading. In the preface we are told that we must not expect reference to be made to 'the doubts, hesitations, and conjectures of Criticism', which no doubt explains why the 'Song of Hannah' is treated as belonging to its present context, why the double narrative of the institution of the monarchy is not analysed, and why 1 Kings 13 is treated as ancient. On the other hand, the late dating of Ezra is accepted. One of the chief merits of the book is that it sends the reader back to the actual text of the Bible; and the student who faithfully studies the text, for instance, of Isaiah or Jeremiah, in accordance with the guidance given will be richly rewarded.

While Mr. Heaton's book too is from the technicalities of scholarship, it is more likely to help a better-equipped type of reader, who is already familiar with the history of prophecy and is ready to make some appraisal of the prophetic teaching as a whole. After a preliminary survey of the material, there follow four other chapters on the prophetic consciousness, the vocation of Israel, ethics and the community, and the future hope. The whole forms an admirable introduction not only to the prophetic theology, but to the message of the Old Testament. There is a touch of freshness and originality about the treatment, which stimulates thought, and, at times, dissent. The author's strictures on the apocalyptists in the last chapter are likely to be criticized in some quarters; but in arguing that the affinities of the Gospel are, above all, with prophecy he is surely right. It may be salutary for some to be reminded that *post hoc ergo melius quam hoc* is one of the more superstitious deductions from the theory of progressive revelation.

G. W. ANDERSON

Luke's Portrait of Jesus, by Hugh Martin. (S.C.M., 6s.)

This is an admirable little book. The author confides in us that the Gospel according to St. Luke 'has always meant more to him than any other single book in the New Testament or out of it'. The glow of this affection warms every page that he has written. The whole book is remarkable for its clarity and conciseness of expression, its avoidance of all irrelevancies, and a most pleasing orderliness. While its presentation of the figure and message of our Lord is based on St. Luke, the other gospels are also used. The beginning and the end of the story are dealt with chronologically, but the middle chapters are

topical—dealing, for instance, with Jesus in relation to the Kingdom, Prayer, the Social Order, and the Family. A reader needs to have his Bible at his elbow for constant reference. In some respects the book has been written in defiance of current fashion. It is almost a return to the kind of work we read when Glover's *Jesus of History* set the pattern for many other authors. But the work of modern scholars is not ignored, and the more positive contributions of Form Criticism are given their place in the introduction, but the author differs from the more sceptical of Form Critics in that he is fully persuaded of the substantial accuracy of the Gospel narrative. His pages are enriched by many apt and effective quotations. One from Erasmus may serve to express the faith in which he himself writes: 'These most sacred writings [the Gospels] bring back to you a living image of His mind, the very Christ speaking, healing, dying, rising, in fact so wholly present that you would see less of Him if you beheld him before your eyes.' C. LESLIE MITTON

The Revelation of St. John the Divine, by Ronald H. Preston and Anthony T. Hanson. (S.C.M., 7s. 6d.)

This is one of the first volumes of a new series called *The Torch Bible Commentaries*, the editors of which aim to provide short commentaries, based upon the findings of critical scholarship, and designed to interpret the Bible to intelligent readers who are not in a position to read the larger commentaries, but are eager to understand the meaning and message of the several books. This little book, of less than 150 pages, would be most suitable to put into the hands of the ordinary reader of the Bible, who is repelled from studying the last book in the New Testament because it seems to him the least valuable, containing so few passages which are edifying and so many which are fantastic in their imagery and seem revolting in their conceptions. Since an understanding of the background, literary and historical, is essential to the interpretation of *The Revelation*, the introduction occupies about one third of the book, and will be found the most valuable part. The commentary itself is a concise guide to elucidate the permanent theological meaning within the images in which the writer clothes his thought. It aims to bring out the essential differences between John's outlook and that of much Western thought, but also to show, in the light of modern scholarship, that by a reverent study of the contents we may be strengthened to believe in a God who is living and active, whose judgements are revealed in history, and who played a decisive part in human affairs when He sent His Son to live among men and to die for them. The authors follow Dr. R. H. Charles in his rearrangements of the verses of the last two chapters, and in distinguishing between the Two Cities, the Millennial and the Eternal. But while they acknowledge their indebtedness to many scholars, they have retained their independence, and have produced a short commentary which will certainly help intelligent readers to understand and appreciate the value of a difficult book, which has suffered much harm from those who regard it as a book of pious riddles to which they have all the answers.

F. B. CLOGG

Calvin's Doctrine of Man, by T. F. Torrance. (Lutterworth Press, 14s.)

The doctrine of man is the crucial issue between Christianity and its rivals today, and it is well that our attention should be directed to Calvin's teaching on the subject, for, scrupulously dependent, almost above all other men, on the Bible, he expounded its doctrine at a time when the problem of man's nature was almost as acute as it is now. Dr. Torrance's method is to set down without comment and as objectively as possible what Calvin has to say, using mostly the Institutes and Commentaries. He presents us with an account which, while it is not easy to read, because of his extreme faithfulness to Calvin's words and the closeness of the argu-

ment, does ample justice to the Reformer's many-sided thought. Man's knowledge of himself, which is possible only through the Law and the Gospel; the image of God in man, which is the gift of God's grace so that man is intended to reflect God's glory; man's total perversity, due to the self-will which turns him wholly and continually away from God and makes natural theology impossible—all these appear in their proper place in a closely articulated system. We may think of Calvin's theology, and therefore, perhaps, of Dr. Torrance's account of it, as a little remote from actual human persons and relationships, but we cannot deny his burning sense both of the reality and glory of God, and of the grace on which we depend for every moment for our existence.

RUPERT E. DAVIES

Some Working-Class Movements of the Nineteenth Century, by Robert F. Wearmouth. (The Epworth Press, 21s.)

It has been a matter of controversy whether Methodism was a hindrance to reform in the nineteenth century or a help. Did it take its stand on the Conservative or Radical side? Dr. Wearmouth helps us to answer this question. He shows that while the larger number of its people stood by the Constitution, there were Methodist preachers and people who were in the front rank in the battle for Reform. He rightly gives us a picture more favourable to the Methodist social contribution than that painted by Mr. and Mrs. J. L. Hammond. He shows that there was much social blindness in Methodism—but that it produced also men of social vision. He points out that when the Radical Societies developed their work by the 'cell' method, meeting together in small groups, they were copying the Methodist plan of Class Meetings. The Chartist Movement too took over from Methodism the idea of the Class-Meeting and Class Leaders, and it also borrowed open-air methods and Camp Meetings. Dr. Wearmouth shows that both in the Miners Trade Union and 'The Industrial Trade Unions' much of the pioneer work was done by Methodist local preachers and evangelists—largely the sons of the Primitive Methodists. Dr. Wearmouth has searched through Home Office Papers, as well as the newspapers of the period, and has produced a thoroughly scientific as well as a human piece of work. He has clearly shown that the history of the working classes cannot be understood without the recognition of the religious creative power which has done so much to mould and shape it. We most heartily commend his book to all classes of readers.

W. BARDSLEY BRASH

The Craft of Sermon Construction, by W. E. Sangster (The Epworth Press, 7s. 6d.)

The Preacher's Handbook, edited by Greville P. Lewis (The Epworth Press, 7s. 6d.)

'In the handiwork of their craft is their prayer' is a text for Dr. Sangster's book. Preachers will be grateful for a timely plea for their craft, which has been overlaid by an excessive emphasis on other tasks. It is no paradox to say both that men are 'called to preach' and that preaching can be taught. Here the Preacher is urged to remember that there are many facets of Truth and he must use several—e.g. Biblical, Social, Evangelical—to maintain a true perspective. Again, the structure of the Sermon is dealt with by a master-craftsman. The chapter on 'Grip' is especially effective—'how the little tendrils of personality which reach out from one another to touch, engage, and hold firm'. It is in this realm that much of our preaching fails—it lacks 'grip'. In his chapter on 'Methods of Preparation' Dr. Sangster gives the clue to this lack. The preacher prepares himself by living unto God, by revering the Bible, by becoming a thinker. As 'every sermon must contain at least one thought, never less' (W. L. Watkinson), the actual preparation begins with a thought or purpose in mind. While the thought is sometimes given, at other times the workman is approved when he plans his own way forward. The sheer hard work of sermon pre-

paration is stressed—there can be no grip without grind. 'Brood, bore, consult, concentrate, split, gather, handle, relate, illustrate, and order' about one central theme. Here is craftsmanship indeed, accompanied by glow of soul. This is a book to study. It breathes the affection of a friend, it communicates the art of a practised craftsman, it reveals the heart of a great preacher. Many readers will go out as heralds with fresh heart and a new zeal, 'with ambassadorial (a veritable Sangster word) humility and authority', to give the Word to the people.

To say as one announcement does that *The Preacher's Handbook* is 'for hard-pressed Lay Preachers who have little time for study' is to do scant justice to an admirable first book in a proposed series. It is a book for every one who is eager to equip himself for the joy of preaching. There is so much material gathered that the volume could be named 'The Complete Preacher'. It shows the herald of the Gospel at the throne of Grace both in his own soul and in leading the congregation, using the Bible and Hymnbook with power and discernment, handling aright the word of truth, moving through the Christian year, living and thinking among his fellows in his own day, proclaiming and interpreting the Lord of life. An appendix to the volume sets the preacher among his colleagues and defines his relation to the Church. All this is well done in one book. One wishes that the advertisements had been omitted, and in symposiums the contributors' names could have been kept for the index. This worthy, well-produced book sets a high standard for its successors.

C. LESLIE BREWER

George Jackson, A Commemorative Volume, by Annie Jackson. (The Epworth Press, 7s. 6d.)

This book is a welcome memorial of a very remarkable personality. One chapter is by Mr. Charles T. Nightingale, and one is by the Rev. F. H. Benson. The rest of the memoir is by Mrs. Jackson, and it may be said at once that the whole volume is well written, and deeply interesting throughout, and that, in spite of the fact that three writers have had some hand in it, the book is a unity. Dr. Jackson's ministry was one of the most memorable in his generation, especially in his unique work in Edinburgh. As a young man of twenty-three he was sent to the Scottish capital. Soon after his arrival in the city a great exhibition was being held which was attended by thousands of visitors from England. There were hardly any evening services in the Scottish churches then. The young probationer saw an opportunity and grasped it with both hands. He took the Synod Hall, filled it with an evening congregation of two thousand, and kept it full for eleven years, until the Central Hall at Tollcross was built. Then he maintained a great ministry there for another five years. Let it be remembered, too, that this ministry was in Edinburgh, a city of great preachers, with Dr. Alexander Whyte at St. George's and Dr. MacGregor at St. Cuthbert's, and many other outstanding men in the metropolitan pulpits. Later Dr. Jackson exercised a great ministry in Canada, and also did a fine work (which he himself, I think, greatly underestimated) at Didsbury, but it was in Scott's 'own romantic town' that he made his name and left his mark. George Jackson will always be identified with Edinburgh. What a charming personality he had! He was the most modest of men, utterly unspoiled by fame. Yet he had a unique kind of fame in his day, for by his work in the pulpit and in the Press he became the leader of the young men of his generation, guiding multitudes of them not only into a love of good literature but into an experience of evangelical religion—a double service the worth of which no man can estimate. I hope this most interesting memoir will be very widely read.

HENRY BETT

SHORT NOTICES

Family Circle, by Maldwyn Edwards. (The Epworth Press, 12s. 6d)

Dr. Edwards has for so long been an ardent student of Dr. Adam Clarke that it was well-nigh inevitable that he would give us a twentieth-century version of Clarke's *Wesley Family*. His theme is the Epworth household in relation to the brothers John and Charles. These two, however, have no monopoly of fame, for Samuel and Susanna, Samuel junior and Hetty, have all helped to make the Epworth family the best-known in English history. When he writes of Hetty, Dr. Edwards is scrupulously fair, both to her and her father, and, not least, to Quiller-Couch. Here and there we notice a looseness of phrasing which might have been avoided. There is the common failure to distinguish between Blundell's School, Tiverton, and Tiverton Grammar School. But this is a book which will keep the reader, be he instructed or uninformed, enthralled from beginning to end.

The Crisis in the University, by Sir Walter Moberly. (S.C.M., 15s.)

Educational institutions inevitably take on the character of the social structure in which they arise. As new social movements demand the revision of social structure, so educational institutions need to be brought into line with them. For some years past the universities of this country have been very severely scrutinized in this regard. This admirably written book, however, stands in a class by itself. It is written with authority, for the author has been till lately Chairman of the University Grants Committee. He also writes emphatically as a Christian and his criticism, therefore, is most searching as well as practical. He shows that we are living today on the accumulated spiritual capital of Greece, Rome, and Israel, but that this is gradually being used up and civilization is changing through the dominance of applied science and under the influence of short-term utilitarianism. The book is a survey not only of the universities but also of the entire thought life of this country. There are inevitably some gaps. For instance, there is not nearly enough reference to adult education although Sir Walter himself has done a great deal in this field. The relation of the theological colleges to the universities might also have been considered and clarified. It is a pity that Sir Walter nowhere deals with what has been not unfairly called the 'Ph.D. racket'. But this book, whatever its omissions, is a very valuable study, which is sure to have a wide influence.

About to Marry, by Douglas W. Thompson. (The Epworth Press, 3s. 6d.)

The author of this useful little book, while working as an Army Chaplain, was a prisoner first in Italy and later in Germany. Many fellow prisoners were either just married, or planned to marry as soon as they were free. Out of their questions and requests for advice grew organized talks in prison camps, and from the notes of these talks has grown this book. It is divided into two sections. First comes 'Foundations', dealing with the origins of marriage, its physical basis, social and psychological factors, and Christian beliefs which affect it. Secondly, 'The Building', under the headings: Our Social Life, Our House, Our Children, Our Married Friendship, and 'Just Us'. When dealing with 'physical basis', the writer has resorted to a compromise. He gives a brief anatomical description, but the reader is referred to other publications for a more detailed account of the sex factor. One regrets this, for the writer's knowledge and good taste show that he might with advantage have dealt with the whole subject. Once, out of delicacy, a term is used which only a few readers will understand, and the last sentence on p. 43 badly needs re-casting. But with a very few exceptions the book is easy to read, clearly expressed, and at once restrained and realistic. The section on Christian beliefs which affect marriage omits

to note the particular stress put by Christianity on the dignity of women. In writing of 'The Synthesis', as he calls Christian Marriage, the author is eminently practical and at his best, both in matter and expression. He comes down frankly on the side of 'family planning'. This book deserves a wide success.

Marriage Counselling, by David R. Mace. (J. & A. Churchill, 8s.)

A book more for the Social Worker than for the man or woman in the street, *Marriage Counselling* could be read with profit by all whose work brings them into contact with people who are in need of help. It opens by telling the reader of broken marriages and of the beginnings of the 'Marriage Guidance Centre'. Much is said, necessarily, of the Counsellor and his need of training, educationally, morally, and spiritually. Chapter 19, which deals with 'Personal Problems', is one of the most revealing of the kind of work undertaken. It seems a pity that one or two stories of the cases could not be given. In Chapter 21 the subject of 'Pre-marital Counselling' is dealt with. Its latter part, with its plea for the preparation of young people for marriage, is especially necessary in these days of hasty marriages. We commend this book to all magistrates who sit on the Matrimonial Bench, all Probation Officers, Ministers of every Denomination, Club Leaders, and all who do similar work.

The Call, by C. E. Norwood. (Independent Press, 6s.)

This little book is primarily concerned with the methods by which Congregational churches are able to transfer ministers from one sphere to another and with the difficulties which arise because the local congregation has the privilege of choosing its own pastor. What can be done to close the wide gap which may exist between a minister's resignation from one charge and his call to another? What may be done to prevent a congregation from having too long and unsettling a period without full ministerial service? The writer seeks to show, by considering historical instances, that the Congregational system of calling ministers can work to the mutual benefit of churches and pastors, and to the glory of God. He also tries to reveal the spiritual equipment necessary for the proper working of the system and to present a pattern of worthy behaviour for those involved in changes of pastorate. Methodists have something to learn, I think, from the emphasis on the covenant relation between a minister and his flock. The writer is suspicious of ecclesiastical machinery and believes that waiting upon God in confident prayer would solve 'the problem of settlements and removals'.

The Shaking of the Foundations, by Paul Tillich. (S.C.M. Press, 10s. 6d.). *The Kindness of God*, by S. W. Carruthers. (The Epworth Press, 4s.). *Studies in Problem Texts*, by J. Sidlow Baxter. (Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 9s. 6d.). *The Fruit of the Light*, by F. Harold Buss. (The Epworth Press, 6s.)

Dr. Tillich is a Prussian who taught in four German universities before the second World War drove him to the United States. In this country he is as yet but little known, but in America his reputation as a philosopher and a Christian teacher is steadily increasing. In his book there are twenty-two 'sermons'. These strong, convincing articles in defence of Christianity as the only possible solution of the problems which perplex the world today are written from an unusual point of view. For Dr. Tillich, Humanity belongs to two 'orders'—the Time order, which is historical, and the Timeless, which is eternal. Now that we are passing through a period when the foundations of all things temporal are being shaken, the only way out is in the rediscovery of the things eternal. And this comes only from Him who gives to us Eternal Life.

The author of the second book is a medical man, a scholar and a well-known elder

in the English Presbyterian Church. One closes his book with a strong appetite for more. But even more impressive than the sermons is the modest 'foreword' in which Dr. Carruthers tells us how he first began to preach in the wards of the Royal Infirmary in Edinburgh. He is a man of many gifts and he has used them all, not least perhaps God's great gift of 'humour'. These eleven sermons are all good, but the best of all comes last—on 'Variety in Heaven'.

Mr. Baxter has selected twelve texts which contain 'problems', toward whose solution he contributes many ingenious and interesting suggestions. To his readers they would be more convincing if he showed some respect for those whose views are not his own, including the greatest of our scholars and commentators. Apparently we must believe that 'all they like sheep have gone astray'.

Mr. Buss has dedicated his book to his 'brother local preachers', but many others will join in thanking him for his collection of short articles, which, while not sermons, contain his life-long 'reflections on Christian discipleship'. Some of his titles are strikingly original—e.g. 'Totalitarian Christianity', 'An Unobedient Christianity', 'The Divine "Yes!"', 'The Glory of going on'. All the articles are enriched by apt quotations; all are obviously designed to serve 'the present age'; and all are definitely 'Methodist'. We recommend this book to all who in these perplexing days are called upon to preach the everlasting gospel of the Love of God.

So Fight I, by Robt. Menzies. (Jas. Clarke & Co., 6s.). *More Things by Parables*, by James Wilkinson. (The Epworth Press, 5s.). *The Steeple and the Crane*, by Herbert L. Bishop. (The Epworth Press, 4s.)

Dr. Menzies' book, subtitled 'Studies in the Christian Life', is divided into two sections, 'Hindrances' and 'Helps', and closes with an Advent sermon on 'Let the peace of Christ rule in your hearts'. It is an inspiration to discover, as one follows the author's line of thought, how the difficulties and obstacles of these days may be accepted, not passively, but, by divine help, dynamically, till they are transmuted into opportunities. Here is the secret of what the writer calls 'the angelic calm . . . the intrepid courage' which was the source of John Wesley's power over the wildest mobs.

Mr. Wilkinson's book deals mainly with some of the shorter and more difficult parables, such as 'The Tower Builder and the King at War' and 'The Unprofitable Servants'. His approach is stimulating and original. Not greatly concerned to affix meanings to the details of the stories, he prefers to fasten on some main message in each parable, not infrequently an unexpected one, and develop that. Mr. Wilkinson always sets his exposition against today's background and makes us feel the challenge that there still is in our Lord's words.

For his volume of children's addresses Mr. Bishop has drawn widely on his experiences as a missionary for over thirty years in various regions of Africa and this gives his book a tang of its own. The addresses are written in a simple colloquial style, and most of them are talks built successfully round objects and events rather than round people. There are two beautiful stories at the end, one on the faithfulness of a native boatman and the other an African illustration of 'The Cup of Cold Water'.

The Lord Jesus Christ, by K. H. Crosby. (The Epworth Press, 7s. 6d.)

This book, written by a former Principal of Union College, Bunumbu, Sierra Leone, does not attempt to cover the whole of Christian theology, but, starting from the earliest Creed, 'Jesus is Lord', deals explicitly with the doctrines of the Incarnation, of the Death, Resurrection and Ascension of Christ, the Holy Spirit, and the Trinity. Within this scheme there is included a good deal about sin and salvation. The book is notable for its lucidity. A great merit of the book is that it is so thoroughly Biblical, though the underlying view of the Cross may seem to many too Abelardian, and

Dr. Crosby seems to assume the Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epistles. The Biblical quotations, unhappily, are from the Basic English version. No doubt the aim in using it is simplicity. The book seems well designed to meet a real need in Africa, and the author rightly hopes that it may be of use elsewhere. Questions for study are provided.

Tutors unto Christ, edited by Stanley B. and Eric G. Frost. (Methodist Youth Dept., 4s). *Six Clues to the Mystery*, by Douglas Griffiths. (The Epworth Press, 2s. 6d.).

Tutors Unto Christ is a more important book than its format suggests. It is the authorized manual for Church Membership Preparation Classes in Methodism. Yet it is disappointing. Make no mistake, the book is good—but for its purpose it ought to have been better! In parts it is too diffuse. For the lay leader without academic training Chapter I is not crisp enough. More serious is the lack of balance. Of a hundred pages two are concerned with the doctrinal emphases of Methodism! And where is the needed statement of the obligations of membership? When the occasion for reprinting comes it is earnestly to be hoped the balance of the manual will be corrected. None the less, the book is a good book.

The title of Mr. Douglas Griffiths' book speaks of six clues, but there are seven! Here is the clue to the secret of preaching to Youth! The six are the addresses broadcast by the author last winter, and intended particularly for Clubs. They are outstandingly good. There is a directness and a relevance about them that is most stimulating.

Responsals, by E. R. Micklem and I. M. S. Cooper. (James Clarke & Co., 3s. 6d.).

Study Notes on Preaching and Worship, by John Bishop. (The Epworth Press, 1s. 6d.).

Learning to Pray, by Geoffrey Parrinder. (The Epworth Press, 3s. 6d.)

Responsals is an attempt to provide responsive acts which can be introduced into any part of a service where they are desired. For the most part they are based on the Psalms, arranged to be said antiphonally by following the dramatic structure of each psalm. The principle is good. Certain passages from the New Testament are arranged in the same kind of way, and a number of liturgical prayers from various sources are incorporated. The selecting and arranging of the material are done well and imaginatively, and the book should greatly enrich the worship of those churches in which it is used. *Study Notes on Preaching and Worship* is intended primarily as the basis of a correspondence course for Local Preachers on trial. There are ten chapters about the call to preach, the spiritual life of the preacher, the preparation and preaching of the sermon, and the ordering and conduct of worship. The book is well written, gives sound practical help, and abounds in good illustrations, pointed aphorisms, and helpful advice. The whole book can be heartily recommended to all preachers. *Learning to Pray*, in its five chapters on Prayer, The Bible, The Church, The Sacraments, and Belief, sets out to give elementary instruction in devotional practice. Some sentences seem too elementary—e.g. 'The greater prophets taught many noble things', 'many of the psalms are on a very high level'. Again, is it well to say that when Jesus was to be born into the world 'God did not take any woman that happened to be handy'? The book, which is meant for 'young Christians', is simple enough for the youngest.

The Unshakable Kingdom, by W. Francis Gibbons. (Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 6s.)

One of the interesting signs of our time is that there is growing up a type of Biblical exposition which remains as orthodox as any fundamentalist tract while having a depth of scholarship and breadth of vision which has sometimes been associated entirely with the left wing of Christian thought. The present volume illustrates this

tendency. In a series of nine sermons the writer expounds eight verses from the twelfth chapter of Hebrews with admirable lucidity, basing his work on an extensive scholarship. These devout and scholarly studies admirably expound the message of one of the most moving passages in the New Testament.

A Guide to Confident Living, by Norman Vincent Peale. (Windmill Press, 9s. 6d.)

This book is intended to offer a solution to personal problems through psychology and religion. It has appeared repeatedly in the American best-seller list, and I have no doubt that many have found it helpful. Dr. Peale offers prescriptions for getting rid of inferiority, fear, and failure, and for attaining success, married happiness, and power. The psychiatry is amateurish and inaccurate, and the religion is of the milk-and-water variety. One grows utterly weary of these books that reduce Jesus Christ to the level of other remedial agencies, and teach people to expect something less of Him than a great miracle. Psychiatry is valuable in its own field; it may be of great aid in the work of the Church; but to write of psychiatry and religion as though they were interchangeable terms is tragedy.

Concerning Worship, by W. D. Maxwell. (Oxford University Press, 8s. 6d.)

Here is a collection of brief and pointed essays by a well-known scholar which should make a wide appeal to ministers and laymen alike. He shows that the modern tendency to improve and popularize worship cannot succeed unless it is 'rooted in the soil of the Christian Evangel'. The chapter headings include: 'Public Worship and Private Prayer', 'Form in Worship', 'The Conduct of Worship', 'The Place of the Sermon in Worship', 'Society and Worship', 'Worship as a Heritage'. There is an appendix on various forms of prayer. Perhaps the most valuable section of the book is the discussion on the Eucharist.

Making Sense of the Universe, by A. Price Hughes. (The Epworth Press, 6s.)

The writer of this series of essays is a friend of the common man who has suffered much and yet is radiant and serene. One of these essays, 'The same Jesus', shows the trend and wealth of them all. Setting an incident of Christ's earthly days alongside one of His resurrection ministry, the writer shows that the same sure touch, the same challenging thought, pervades the two stories—that it is the same Jesus at work. This is a fine book for bewildered Christians.

Edwin Arlington Robinson, by Emery Neff. (Methuen & Co., 15s.)

This is a volume in the new and interesting 'American Men of Letters' series. The story of Robinson's life is a sad one. He was haunted by poverty. Theodore Roosevelt once came to his rescue by giving him a sinecure, but it did not last long, for when Roosevelt went out of office the appointment lapsed. Robinson gave way to drink repeatedly, and altogether the record is rather squalid. But there is no doubt that Robinson was a poet. His longer and more ambitious poems are not likely to last, but some of his shorter lyrics are sure always to find a place in anthologies of American verse. Dr. Neff seems concerned to make out that Robinson was a pioneer in a modernist style of verse, and this may be true to a limited extent, but his very best work is to be found in a few polished lyrics that are true to the most severe traditions of classical verse. The best of all these, probably, is *The White Lights*, which has the recondite quality of some of the best of our seventeenth-century verse.

Contemporary History, by F. W. Pick. ('Pen in Hand', Oxford, 10s. 6d.)

This collection of historical studies should be useful to students of recent diplomatic and military history. Dr. Pick is a born archivist. He examines, in the light of

documents only now accessible, such things as the diplomatic relations of the U.S.A. and Japan, the Anglo-French and Russian negotiations for a military alliance in 1939, the German military plot of 1944 to kill Hitler, and the Irish Republic. For the most part, Dr. Pick confines himself to analysing and setting forth information rather than expressing personal opinions. Some of his judgements, however, deserve close attention. For instance, turning the Marxian argument against its own champions, he suggests that we should consider whether Russian Communism (like Capitalism!) is anything more than a superstructure to hide nationalistic aims.

The Autobiography of a Turkish Girl, translated from the Turkish by Sir Wyndham Deedes. (Allen & Unwin, 15s.)

This book reads as if it were no translation at all but a story about Turkey written by an English enthusiast, for the eyes of the Turkish Girl have ceased to be 'eastern'. The tale, as we have it, is a good tale and not without humour. Çalikusu, a teacher with a modern education and a loving heart, is set in contrast to an older instructress, Hatije Hanim, who believes in the whip and the confusion of tongues. Here is Çalikusu's method vindicated: 'The children began to understand what was said to them, and even Hatije Hanim, who believed that the more they shouted the more the lesson was implanted in their minds, was satisfied at last'. 'But', the writer says, 'it wasn't merely that I was after; what I wanted was to give the children a little life and a little joy. Their lips didn't know what it was to laugh; their tired eyes, heavy with care, looked as though they were thinking of death.' In a world of ruffians Çalikusu maintains her gay crusade and her innocence. She is befriended by a rough army doctor. In his death he prepares the way for her return to her own home nest and her own first love.

From My New Shelf

BY C. RYDER SMITH

Christianity and History, by Herbert Butterfield. (G. Bell & Sons, 7s. 6d.)

Professor Butterfield is an Evangelical Christian who now sits in the Chair at Cambridge where Lord Acton, the Liberal Catholic, once sat. This book is 'an amplified version' of six broadcasts that made a great impression. In them Professor Butterfield quietly repudiates certain ways of treating the relation between Christianity and History. For instance, he thinks that in this sphere Lord Acton paid too much attention to the part played in history by great ecclesiastical statesmen; he thinks that the current claim that Christianity lies behind most of the social improvements in history cannot be made good; and he thinks that the Church makes a mistake if it commits itself to *any* programme for the future, since the complexity of history is so great and the unforeseen so often occurs that a programme often works out in unexpected and not wholly Christian ways. He would not wish the Church to commit itself even to the programme of the Four Freedoms. On the other hand, he holds that the chief contribution of Christianity to history has been made and is still made through the 'leaven' of multitudes of 'ordinary' Christian lives. In four chapters he shows that the Old Testament Prophets, when they spoke of sin, of God's judgements in history, of His working through 'tragic conflict', and of Providence, told the truth. In other words, he thinks that little Israel has as great an importance for the historian as little Attica. He believes, again, that God's great purpose in history is to prepare individual men for eternity. On other subjects too he has a quiet and weighty word to say as he goes along. The first lecture discusses the limits

of 'technical history' in relation to religion. Such a synopsis does little justice to the wealth of the book. It may prove to be a classic on its subject.

Recovery Starts Within, edited by the Bishop of London. (Oxford Press, 6s.)

This is 'the book of the (Anglican) Mission to London, 1949'. Bishop Wand describes the preparations for it in a foreword and its results in an epilogue. A series of eight addresses given in St. Paul's by Dean Matthews fills half of the book. Here there appear two of the three ways in which the method of evangelism used in the Mission differs from the older way. The appeal is to the mind rather than to the emotions, and the Dean, even when he has to introduce such phrases as 'the Kingdom of God' and 'the forgiveness of sins', presents the message to the intelligent 'modern man' in the language that he understands. Five addresses follow that illustrate the third characteristic of this kind of evangelism—the social gospel ensues on the individual gospel. For the most part these addresses follow the lines familiar since COPEC, but Bishop Narborough writes of 'leisure' without discussing sport, and Mr. D. R. Davies, writing on 'the Modern State', goes his own provocative way as is his wont. The title of the book, *Recovery Starts Within*, is a modern way of saying: 'Ye must be born again.' This method of evangelism will not often yield 'spectacular results', but it is a method to ponder.

Existence and Analogy, by E. L. Mascall. (Longmans, Green & Co., 12s. 6d.)

This book is a sequel to Mr. Mascall's earlier work, *He Who Is*, but it may be read by itself. It is true that at first a reader may keep asking himself, 'What does the writer mean by this or that term?'—and for this subject the definition of terms is very important—but, as he goes on reading, he finds that exact definitions are furnished. Again, Mr. Mascall, while he is a convinced Thomist, does not idolize Aquinas, but thinks for himself. For instance, he argues that St. Thomas's famous Five Proofs of the existence of God do not accurately represent Aquinas's own thought. Again, he is not afraid to use the works of modern existentialists, and his book, in particular, will guide a reader to the chief French exponents of Catholic existentialism. Like St. Thomas, Mr. Mascall believes that 'the plain man' is right in assuming *sans* argument that 'objects' or 'things' exist—but he also believes that reason has an indispensable part to play in theology, for the 'plain man' does not rightly understand all that his postulate implies. Our author argues that the plain man's experience is not just of an 'object', but of 'finite being as manifesting God in his creative act'. It is likely that the plain man of Aquinas's day would have admitted this, when once he understood it, but would his modern counterpart admit it even then? Still, one should not look for apologetic in an exegetical book. But it might also be asked whether Mr. Mascall does justice to the word 'creative' in his own definition. Does not this require that creativity, as well as will and act, is an existential element in God? Is it enough to say, in reply, that no 'creature' can add anything to Him? Again, Mr. Mascall is so engrossed in discussing *what* the plain man experiences that he has hardly anything to say about the man *who* has the experience—i.e. he concentrates over-much on the 'objective' side of the experience, as he comes near admitting when he deals at some length with Dr. Farrer's *Finite and Infinite*. Mr. Mascall's book, again, leaves some questions unasked. Would he claim, for instance, that the cancer germ is a 'finite being' that 'manifests God in his creative act'? Or, again, why do even 'good' creatures all fail to reach the perfection after which, as Mr. Mascall claims, they all strain? Surely this class of problems ought at least to have been mentioned in this book.

While these and other such questions may be asked, this is an able and timely book. There is no doubt that men do habitually use the categories of 'existence and

analogy' in their day-to-day thinking and acting, and it is desirable—and for the theologian and philosopher necessary—that the meaning and implications of these categories should be examined. A discussion of the meaning of 'analogy' was even more needed than of 'existence'. In his chapter about it Mr. Mascall's difficult book reaches its climax of difficulty, but it is none the less welcome. It is of no use crying out for easy metaphysics.

Story of American Protestantism, by Andrew Landale Drummond. (Oliver and Boyd, 30s.)

Dr. Drummond divides his volume into five 'Books'. The first, a very good Book, deals with the Colonial Period, and the fifth with religion since the Civil War. In the intermediate books the names of the chapters are not always adequate and Dr. Drummond has rather often anticipated the period after the Civil War. The problem of arrangement must have been very difficult, and the author has not altogether solved it. Perhaps this is why his book is called 'Story' rather than 'History'. After the first Book it lacks clear plan and perspective. There are certain marks of the Protestantism of the United States, and Dr. Drummond names them, though sometimes almost incidentally. For instance, the Protestant Churches of U.S.A. are not only the largest but the most influential in the world. Or again, from the days of 'The Great Awakening' under Jonathan Edwards and Whitefield the United States has been *the* Land of Evangelism, or, if the word is preferred, Revivalism. Or again, it is *the* land of the Small Sects, and *the* land of pragmatic religion. Again, one of the dominant characteristics of the story is the inter-action of the East (particularly New England) and West. Dr. Drummond thinks that in recent books the influence of the ever-advancing Frontier has been exaggerated, but there is no doubt that it was great. What the Americans call 'imperialism' in others they used to call 'manifest destiny' in themselves. As already suggested, Dr. Drummond mentions all these things, but they do not dominate the reader's attention. If a reader is ready to provide perspective for himself, he will find this book very rich indeed. Of course, one may challenge a detail sometimes. Scrooby is not in East Anglia. Parkman is hardly the 'historian of the Jesuits'. Wesley's discouragement of such things as hysteria is not mentioned until one comes to Moody. With the evangelism of Gipsy Smith (who is not mentioned) in view, can it be claimed that 'revivalism' reached its term with Moody and his retinue? But Dr. Drummond, a Scotsman who evidently knows New England intimately, has ransacked the relevant literature for all periods, and on almost every page he skilfully illustrates his points by brief quotations from contemporary writings. On almost every page, too, there is a good story. Sometimes a careless reader might almost suppose that Dr. Drummond, in his zeal for a College-educated ministry, thinks culture at least as important as evangelism. He dislikes and suspects emotionalism, and one wonders how he would have felt at Pentecost. He practises an easy irony. Perhaps the following phrase defines accurately enough his attitude to Methodism: 'Now that the Methodist Church is passing from its primitive frontier stage to maturity.' The index is not complete—for instance, the names of Bishop Simpson, John R. Mott, and Bishop Brent are omitted. There are many excellently graphic sketches of 'leading men'. Is Whitefield's the greatest name of all? The stories of architecture and hymnology (without mention of Charles Wesley) are included. Many English readers will have some surprises—e.g. very soon after Seabury's consecration at Aberdeen, the Archbishop of Canterbury consecrated two other American Bishops; the Quakers did not attempt to evangelize the Indians of Pennsylvania; it was the negroes themselves who first demanded separate churches. I have greatly enjoyed reading this wealthy book, spite my 'grouse' about perspective. It tells a tale that was clamant for the telling.

The Small Sects in America, by Elmer T. Clark. (Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, via The Epworth Press, \$3.)

Dr. Elmer has rightly issued a revised and up-to-date edition of this book for, as he says, it deals with a neglected part of Church History, and the earlier edition has long been out-of-print. He has taken great pains in tracing the most obscure sects, down to those who have only a single congregation, not infrequently undertaking a personal investigation. At the same time he has included some Churches of considerable size whose teachings are extravagant. He has found classification difficult, for there is much overlapping, and perhaps it would have been better if he had called one class 'communal' rather than 'communistic'. He shows that almost all the sects had their roots in Europe, or at least anticipations there, though in America they have proliferated without precedent. A large number are either negro or frontier products, though there are also many of a more sophisticated origin, notably in modern California. There has been much cult of such strange heroes as Father Divine and Amy Macpherson. All the large Churches have furnished founders but Methodism seems here to lead the line. When Dr. Clark points out that there were sometimes extraordinary phenomena under the preaching of Wesley, ought he not to have added that Wesley discouraged them, at length suggesting that they came from the Devil, while practitioners in American 'subjectivist sects' encourage and induce them? He does not omit such Churches as the Orthodox and the Old Catholic. In the story of the last it almost looks as if, whenever one bishop ordained another, the latter proceeded to lead a schism! Here and there he is hardly accurate. For instance, he quotes the saying that 'the French Reformed Church was blotted out in blood', and this is not quite true. Under J. A. Dowie ought he not to have mentioned the crusade against the pig? To exemplify the teachings of the more bizarre sects, one might mention the belief that the earth is the inside of a hollow ball, the belief that both Adam and Jesus were androgynous, and the belief that in baptism the candidate must be bent, not backwards, but forwards! But, as Dr. Clark says, these sects are to be pitied, not derided. Almost all of them appeal to some arbitrarily selected parts of the Bible. While Romanists may say 'You see the results of giving the Book to the common man', Protestants may reply 'No, see rather the results of leaving him to his own devices when you have given it to him'—but is not this to admit guilt? As Dr. Clark claims, there is no other book on this theme to compare with this one. Of course, he can only find space for a few statistical lines about many sects, but he has sufficiently expounded the types and he gives vivid snap-shots of the chief leaders. The book closes with a good chapter on general 'Characteristics' and useful indexes.

The Socialist Tragedy, by Ivor Thomas. (Latimer House, 10s. 6d.)

Here, in effect, Mr. Thomas tells us why he crossed the floor of the House of Commons. He had come to the conclusion that Socialism inevitably leads to Communism and that 'Social Democrats', to whom he dedicates the book, must choose between Socialism and Democracy. Much of the book explores the story of Socialism and Communism in the last hundred years. There is no room here to examine Mr. Thomas's argument. It is not unlikely that some Socialist will write a book to say, 'Well, but . . .'. This is an *ex parte* statement, but an able one.

Poetry and Personal Responsibility, by George Every. (S.C.M., 2s. 6d.)

The writer of this 'interim report on contemporary literature' knows his subject through and through. The right word for it, I think, is 'insight', not least in the relation of letters to the Faith. There are first three chapters on poetic novels (with Herbert Read, James Joyce, and Charles Williams as chief), then three on poetry

pur sang (with Charles Williams again, Eliot, and Edith Sitwell in the fore-front), and finally two which deal with the passing of the 'schism between art and serious thinking' and explain, in part, the title of the book. The author writes for initiates rather than beginners, but the former will find his book full of suggestive exposition. As he concludes his skilled diagnosis, he reports that there are some signs that the period of pessimism is over.

BOOKLETS AND PAMPHLETS

Preparation for Marriage. (The Epworth Press, 9d.), by R. M. L. Waugh first takes 'those about to be married' through the Marriage Service and then talks quietly to them on 'The Art of Living Together'. The truth that a Christian husband and wife are called to be ministers of God to each other might have been made even more explicit, but this booklet is as sound as it is simple. . . . 'You parsons will talk your own lingo', said the man-in-the-street. 'What about Eric Baker's broadcasts on the Gospel and the Church?' I said. 'Oh, they are all right except for the word "eternal"', said he. 'Don't be a fool,' I said. The booklet is called *From the Church in the Orchard* (The Epworth Press, 2s.) . . . In *Co-operation and Human Rights* (Co-operative Union, Manchester 4, 2s.) Dr. F. W. Pick gives an able account of the history behind the United Nations' 'Declaration of Human Rights' and of its meaning, with text and bibliography. His favourite word, of course, is 'co-operation'. . . . 'Well', said the cinema manager, 'you can try once and we'll see.' And Rev. Leonard P. Barnett won his audience straight off, and talked for five minutes every week through the winter. In *A Parson at the Pictures* (The Epworth Press, 1s. 6d.) there are fifteen of his talks. The subjects range from a parson's collar to Gandhi. . . . In Mr. S. Philipp Landor's play, *Temper the Bleak Wind* (The Epworth Press, 2s. 6d.), he marries two Gospel stories about the Forgiveness of Jesus (Mark 2¹⁻¹¹ and John 8¹⁻¹²), gives them a background of his own, and modernizes a little—but he 'gets home'. . . . In the latest Manual of Fellowship, *The Gospel According to St. Paul* (The Epworth Press, 1s.), the Rev. Ronald V. Spivey expounds four of the key passages in Romans. He illustrates by 'modern instances'. I wish he could have found room for 5¹²⁻²¹ (and does not the Basic rendering of 3²⁵ over-simplify?). Romans, like *Hamlet*, is *caviare* to the superficial, but, if anyone is ready to wrestle with it, he may well begin with these thirty excellent pages and their *questionnaires*.

NOTABLE ARTICLES IN PERIODICALS

The Journal of Religion, July (University of Chicago, via Cambridge Press, \$1.75).

Church and State (especially in U.S.A.), by Edwin E. Aubrey.

Christian Faith and Process Philosophy, by Bernard M. Loomer.

A Study of Cowper's *Olney Hymns*, by Lodwick Hartley.

The Scottish Journal of Theology, September (Oliver & Boyd, 3s. 6d.)

Articles on 'Amsterdam' by J. L. M. Haire, K. C. H. Warner, T. F. Torrance, and J. K. S. Reid.

The Presbyterian in Presbyterianism, by J. H. S. Burleigh.

Universalism or Election?, by T. F. Torrance.

The Journal of Theological Studies, July–October (Oxford Press, 10s.)

The Witness of the Prophets to Hebrew Tradition, by H. F. D. Sparkes.

Three Recent Editions of the Greek New Testament (II), by G. D. Kilpatrick.

The Christian Book and the Greek Papyri, by C. H. Roberts.

Megilloth Genuzoth (*re* the new Cave manuscripts), by H. Danby.

The Position of the Cana Miracle and the Cleansing of the Temple in St. John's Gospel, by H. W. Montefiore.

Bulletin of Rylands Library, September (Manchester University Press, 7s. 6d.)

The Problem of the Epistle to the Hebrews, by T. W. Manson.

(My) Investigations into the Old Testament Problem; The Results, by Edward Robertson.

Recent Discovery and the Patriarchal Age, by Harold H. Rowley.

The Masks of Greek Comedy, by T. B. L. Webster

- The Hibbert Journal*, October (Allen and Unwin, 3s. 6d.)
 Electronics and Free-Will, by Sir Robert Watson-Watt.
 The Nation and the Prayer-Book, by W. R. Matthews.
 Anonymous Ethics—a Symposium, Part II, by H. B. Acton, Pepita Haazrahi, and J. D. Mabbott.
 Logical Positivism and Theory of Knowledge, by C. E. M. Joad.
 The Tyranny of Freedom (in Universities), by Elizabeth Sewell.
- Theology Today*, October (Princeton, New Jersey, via B. H. Blackwell, Oxford, 3s. 6d.)
 The Present Theological Situation in the Light of the Continental Development, by Paul Tillock.
 Existentialism—Christian and Anti-Christian, by Helmut Kuhn.
 The Totalitarian University and Christian Higher Education, by Arnold S. Nash.
 Reflections on the Church and the University, by Paul L. Lehmann.
- The Expository Times*, October (T. & T. Clark, 1s. 3d.)
 Man in the New Testament, by T. Powley Addison.
 (The Preacher as) Prophet and Craftsman, by William Barclay.
 Christianity and Other Religions (today), by John Foster.
- ib.*, November.
 'Interpreted by Love', by J. W. Hunkin.
 The Divine Image in Man, by H. F. Lovell Cocks.
 Natural Law and Dogma, by W. Lillie.
- The Congregational Quarterly*, October (Independent Press, 2s. 6d.)
 In June last the International Congregational Council met at Wellesley, Massachusetts, and this is a 'Wellesley Conference Number'. Six papers are printed—which, broadly speaking, follow the 'Amsterdam' patter—and the Council's Message to the (Congregational) Churches. The contribution of Congregationalism to ecumenicity is mentioned hopefully in the Editorial, but not explored.
- The International Review of Missions*, October (Edinburgh House, 3s. 6d.)
 Missionary Strategy and the Rural Church, by J. Merle Davis.
 The Way of Salvation and the Burman Buddhist, by H. J. Harwood.
 Christianity in Japan, 1549-1949, by C. Kenneth Gansbury.
 A Central African Question of Morals (Birth Divining), by J. T. Munday.
 The Claims of the Non-Christian Religions in regard to Revelation (chiefly Hinduism), by M. H. Harrison.
- Bibliotheca Sacra*, July-September (Theological Seminary, Dallas 4, Texas, \$2.80 per annum.)
 The Eternal Security of the (elect) Believer, Part I, by Lewis Sperry Chafer.
 Amillennialism in the Ancient Church, by John F. Walwood.
 Contemporary Amillennial Literature (continued), by Homer Lemuel Payne.
 Archaeology and the Israelite-Aramaean Wars (concluded), by Merrill F. Unger.
- Teachers of Today*, Sept.-Nov. (Religious Education Press, 6d.)
 A Basic Faith for Youth Today, by a Layman.
 Religion and the People, by John Gatrell.
 Aims and Ideals in School Hymn-Singing, by C. E. Strange.
- The Yale Review*, Autumn (Yale University Press, via Oxford Press, \$4.00 per annum.)
 Chinese Communism: Epoch or Episode?, by Nathaniel Peffer.
 Sketches for the Roosevelt Portrait, by David M. Potter.
 The Problem of the Palestine Refugees (and of the Near East), by Bayard Dodge.
 Retrospect on (a recent visit to) Germany, by Eldon W. Griffiths.
 In the Low Country of Ceylon, by Dillon Ripley.
 Mathematics comes out of the Classroom, by Gerard Piel.
- The Journal of Politics*, August (The University Press, Gainesville, Florida, \$4.50 per annum.)
 Presidency Outside the United States, by Karl Loewenstein.
 Articles on Marxism, Revolution and Democracy, 1848-1948, by Eduard Heimann, Sigmund Neumann, and Leslie Lipson.
 The Guarantee of a Republican Form of Government (in new States of U.S.A.), by Charles O. Lerche.

Our Contributors

- ALAN L. BROWN
B.A.
- J. F. BUTLER
M.A., PH.D.
- JOAN M. FRAYN
- J. LAWSON GARFORTH
- CHARLES GIMBLETT
M.A.
- F. BROMPTON HARVEY
- BERNARD E. JONES
M.A., B.D.
- DOW KIRKPATRICK
M.A.
- ALLEN LEA
- JESSIE POWELL
- C. RYDER SMITH
B.A., D.D.
- ERIC S. WATERHOUSE,
M.A. D.D. D.LIT.
- PHILIP S. WATSON
M.A.
- GUSTAF WINGREN
THEOL. DR.
- FRIEDRICH WUNDERLICH
DR. THEOL.
- English Master, Queen Elizabeth's Grammar School, Hexham, Northumberland.
- Successively Demy of Magdalen College, Oxford; Henry Fellow at Harvard University; Student and Assistant Tutor of Didsbury College, Manchester; Professor of Philosophy, Madras Christian College; Army Officer; Army Chaplain; Editorial Secretary of the Christian Literature Society, Madras.
- B.A., 1st class hon. Classics, University of London; Warr Memorial Prize, King's College, 1939. Ph.D., in the Department of Humanity, University of Edinburgh, conferred 1945 for a thesis on Graeco-Roman religion. Appointed Senior Classics Mistress at Thistley Hough School for Girls, Stoke-on-Trent, January 1946.
- Methodist Missionary stationed in the Dornakal Diocese of the Church of South India.
- Methodist Minister. Special Studies (Trinity College, Cambridge), Philosophy and Education. Formerly Assistant-master, Taunton School. First Head Master, Haigh College, South China. Author of *Pilot Prayers*, etc.
- Methodist Minister. Contributor to the *Times Literary Supplement*, the *Contemporary Review*, the *Nineteenth Century and After* and *The London Quarterly Review*, etc.
- Methodist Minister. Part-time lecturer in Ethics and Psychology at Hartley Victoria College.
- Minister of Sharp Memorial Methodist Church, Young Harris, Georgia, U.S.A., and Chaplain of Young Harris Methodist College.
- Methodist Minister. Ex-President of South African Methodist Conference; for some time General Missionary Secretary (S.A.). Author of *Natives Separated Church Movement in South Africa*, *Twice to the Heart of Africa*, and *Methodist Union in South Africa*; and contributor to religious journals.
- Playwright and producer, has experience of village, town, and suburban drama groups in connexion with Methodist and Anglican Churches as well as inter-denominational organizations. Author of *Living Water*, *Kindled at Thy Flame* (C.M.S.), *The Fare to Tarshish*, *Ploughshares and Pruning Hooks* (N.S.S.U.), etc. Member of the R.D.S. Council.
- Principal, Richmond College, London University, 1929-40. Professor in Theology, 1932-40. President Methodist Church, 1931. Author of many theological books.
- Professor of the Philosophy of Religion in the University of London, since 1931. Lecturer in Philosophy, Richmond College, 1920; Principal, 1940. Author of numerous works, including *Modern Theories of Religion*, *The Psychology of Religious Experience*, *The Philosophical Approach to Religion*. Contributor to Hastings' *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics* and religious journals.
- Tutor in Systematic Theology and Philosophy of Religion, Handsworth College, Birmingham. Translator of *Agape and Eros II*; author of *The Slave as a Servant of God and Let God be God!*
- An outstanding younger Swedish Lutheran theologian. Deputy Professor in the Theological Faculty of the University of Lund. Deputized for Karl Barth at Basel, April-July 1947. Author of books on Luther's doctrine of Vocation, the theology of Irenaeus, etc.
- Principal of the *Prediger-Seminar der Methodistenkirche in Deutschland* (the German Methodist Theological College), Frankfurt am Main.

ly

at

e;

in

al

y,

o-

ry

ch

),

on

of

ae

as

at

a,

e;

w

a,

s

n

s

g

t-

i.

r

r

,,

;

us

/

n

-

;

/

f

.

e